DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 349 95 PS 007 838

AUTHOR Ware, William B.; And Others
TITLE Assistance to Local Follow Through Programs. Annual Report.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. for Development of Human Resources.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 74
GRANT OEG-0-8-522394-3991(286)
NOTE 296p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$14.59 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; Data Analysis; *Elementary Education; Family Environment; Family School Relationship; *Home Programs; Home Visits; Interviews; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Parent Attitudes; *Parent Education; Parent Participation; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Role; Training
IDENTIFIERS Florida Parent Education Follow Through Model; *Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

This report of the 1974 Florida Parent Education Follow Through Program contains evaluation data pertaining to parents, children, teachers, and parent educators from 11 communities. The program emphasis is on the development of: (1) nonprofessionals as parent educators, (2) materials for family use, and (3) parents as partners in the educational program of their children. Part 1 contains a rationale and an outline of the key elements of the program; Part 2 lists the program goals for parents, children, and for classroom and school. Part 3 describes program implementation procedures (including on-site training workshops and consultant visits), the Policy Advisory Committee activities, and evaluation of data concerning parents, home environment, home visits, the children, teachers, parent educators, and home learning activities. Achievement results of children in each community in the program are presented separately. Appendixes, which make up more than one-half of the document, contain detailed charts on the evaluation results and a variety of forms and materials used in conjunction with the program. (CS)

ED107349

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Assistance to Local Follow Through Programs

OEG-0-8-522394-3991 (286)

ANNUAL REPORT

December, 1974

William B. Ware
Gordon E. Greenwood
Patricia P. Olmsted
W. F. Breivogel
Ira J. Gordon

Institute for Development of Human Resources
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Through the

Florida Educational Research
and Development Council

W. F. Breivogel, Executive Director

PS 007338

00002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I

Rationale 1
Key Elements 3

Part II

Program 6
For Parents 6
For Children 7
For Classroom and School 7

Part III

Procedures 8
Training Programs - Communities 8
Training Programs - On-site Workshops 10
In Service Program Support - School Year On-site 11
PAC Activities 17
Evaluation Procedures 19
Parents 21
Additional Parent Data 35
Vertical Diffusion 35
Home Environment 39
Parental Self Concept 47
Parent Knowledge of DTBs 47
Parent Interview 49
Children 50
Additional Child Data 72
Teachers 85
Parent Educators 115
Home Visit Data 124
Summary of PEWR Data 131
Home Learning Activity Data 131
Summary 134

Appendix A Parental Attitudes Toward the Follow Through Program
Appendix B Forms and Letters in Conjunction with the Parent Interview
Appendix C Tabulated Results from Parent Interviews
Appendix D Tables of Means, Standard Deviations and Gains for Individual Communities by Grade Level for the IFMF Results

00003

Appendix E Home Learning Activity Individualization Data
Appendix F PECE Materials
Appendix G Summer Workshop Agenda
Appendix H Winter Workshop Agenda
Appendix I Consulting Procedures
Appendix J Individual Community Reports

Institute for Development of Human Resources
Follow Through Project

ANNUAL REPORT

I. Rationale

A considerable body of research literature indicates that a major source of a student's pattern of achievement and motives for achievement, as well as his personality structure, is the home in which he grows up. The behavior and attitudes of his parents, as well as the nature of the physical setting and materials provided, have a direct impact on his behavior before and during the school years. In particular, three elements of the home may be categorized: demographic factors (housing, income, ethnic membership), cognitive factors, and emotional factors. The cognitive variables might be further defined as the amount of academic guidance provided, the cognitive operational level and style of the parents, the cultural activities they provide, the amount of direct instruction they engage in, their educational aspirations, their language structure, the frequency of language interaction, and the intellectuality they provide such as in books, magazines, and the like.

The parental emotional factors may be conceived of as the consistency of management and disciplinary patterns, the parents' own emotional security and self-esteem, their belief in internal versus external control of the environment, their own impulsivity, their attitudes toward school, the willingness to devote time to their children, and their patterns of work (Gordon, 1968, 1970). If these factors do contribute to child performance, then one phase of the educational program should be the education of parents to be aware of and use their talents to increase the

09095

achievement motivation, intellectual behavior, and self-esteem of the child. The Florida Parent Education Follow Through Program, therefore, was designed to work directly in the home, so that the home situation might lead to better school and life performance. Most parents are good parents, interested and concerned about their children, with high hopes for them. All parents can continue to grow and learn ways to work with their children, which helps them in school and life. The Florida Program assumes that parents are adequate; it is designed to enhance this adequacy.

Not all of the child's behavior, obviously, is a function of the home. The school itself plays an integral role in the intellectual and personality development of the child. The nature of the curriculum, the mode of teacher behavior, the classroom ecology, all influence not only immediate behavior but also patterns of behavior for the future. Any program of compensatory education needs to work not only in the home but also in the school. The Florida Program, therefore, provides ways of changing the classroom organization, teaching patterns, and influencing the curriculum in a Follow Through classroom through (1) the use of paraprofessionals and, (2) the development, by the teaching team (teachers and paraprofessionals) of appropriate home learning activities growing out of the classroom program, and the parents' desires and needs.

The program emphasis is on (1) the development of nonprofessionals as parent educators, and as effective participants in the classroom teaching process; (2) the development of appropriate instructional tasks which can be carried from the school into the home to establish a more effective home learning environment; and, (3) the development of parents as partners in the educational program for their children. Our belief is

that the most effective program for children creates a partnership between home and school. The goals are to bring about changes in the learning environments, both home and school, so that the child's intellectual and affective development will be enhanced. To accomplish this, the key elements of the program are as follows:

Key Elements

Major elements of the program are (1) the training of mothers (two to each classroom) in the role of combined parent educator and teacher auxiliary; (2) training the teacher in the use of paraprofessional personnel; (3) development of materials for family use which take into account not only the school's goals for the child, but also, and equally, the family's expectations, goals, life style and value system; and, (4) involvement of the Policy Advisory Committee in all phases of the program.

Both teacher and parent educator are taught procedures for the development of teaching tasks. The parent education activity consists of periodic (preferably once a week) home visits in which the major activity is the demonstration and teaching of the mother in tasks that have been devised in school to increase the child's intellectual competence and personal and social development. A set of criteria are used by the teaching team in both the development and assessment of their materials. Responsibility for curriculum development rests in the local community. In each community, a library of activities has been developed which can be used by any Follow Through teacher, regardless of grade level, when the activity matches the child and home. A learning activity (task) may be used for many children, or may fit just a few. These tasks are developed to enhance not only the cognitive or academic

development of the child, but also to strengthen the parent-child bond, to involve siblings, both older and younger, in the Follow Through child's learning. They are not "homework," but game-type supplements. They are not designed as "remedial work" nor are they to be seen as serving "problem" children. They are for all children in the Follow Through classroom. As a part of the demonstration in teaching, the parent educator helps the parent understand the purposes of each task, how to perform it, and how to estimate the ability of the child to complete the task. But tasks are not a one-way street. The parent educator not only encourages the parents to develop their own adaptations of the material, she also actively solicits from the parents their ideas about activities which have worked for them, their suggestions for future tasks, and their views about schooling. These, in turn, are used by the Follow Through teachers and parent educators in the creation of new activities, with credit given to parent-originators. In this fashion the school is influenced by the home, and the parent is enhanced.

The parent educator also serves as the first line liaison person between the Follow Through program and the home. She serves as a referral agent for medical, dental, psychological and social services, by informing the mother of the existence of such services and, depending upon the community, establishing the contact between the home and a representative of these services. This requires that the parent educator understand the nature of other Follow Through and community services in addition to understanding her role in the task area. She also informs the parents about PAC meetings and other school functions, and encourages involvement not only in task development, but in the whole range of community-school relationships.

In the school, the parent educator serves as a teacher auxiliary implementing instructional activities through working with individuals or small groups on various learning tasks. A basic element in the Florida Program is the recognition of the paraprofessional as a member of the teaching team. Under supervision, parent educators perform a wide range of activities in the classroom, and are not confined to housekeeping, clerical or child care duties. Basic to the creation of sound home learning tasks is a knowledge of the child and his behavior in the classroom. By working with the children on school activities, the parent educator comes to know them. She thus can, after planning with the teacher, inform parents about the progress of the child.

The parent educator spends about half her time in home visits; her load being half the families in the class. Her remaining time is spent at school, working in the classroom, planning with the teacher, reporting to the teacher about her visits, and participating in inservice education. In several communities, organized staff development programs in local institutions of higher education offer the paraprofessional additional opportunities for personal career development.

A key person in the program is the classroom teacher. She supervises the classroom work of the parent educator and assists her in planning and implementing the parent education activities. She, with the assistance of the parent educators, develops and selects the home learning tasks. She briefs the parent educator before the visits, and receives her report after. In order to perform these duties, the teacher needs additional planning time, and many of the communities have built such time into their schedules. Further, the teacher receives effective technical help

00609

from a second or third adult in the classroom in carrying out the general goal of reaching each child. She finds that there is increased parent understanding and support for her efforts. She also learns ways to work with other adults which increase her professional competence.

Parents are encouraged not only to visit the school and the classroom, but to take part in working with children in the room. Parents are not seen as observers or bystanders, but as people who can contribute to the education of all children. Thus, in a room the teacher may have several adults carrying out a variety of learning activities. She becomes, then, better able to assess and meet individual needs because she is freed from the tyranny of large class instruction, and from the myth that children only learn when the teacher is teaching. She learns, through the creation of all home materials, ways to reorganize her classroom for individual and small group learning.

The community appoints a full-time coordinator who is responsible for all components of the Follow Through program. The coordinator attends the workshop at the University of Florida and works closely with the program sponsor in implementing the Florida components.

II. Program Goals

As stated above, we seek changes in the learning environments and in children. The changes we seek in learning environments are in adult behavior and attitudes rather than in the physical setting. Specifically, we aim for changes in:

1. For parents.

   a. Increase parents' use of desirable teaching behaviors in the instruction of their children.

b. Increase or maintain at a high level the use of time spent with the child on educational recreational activities.

c. Increase or maintain at a high level the use of library community resources, reading materials in the home.

d. Increase or maintain at a high level attendance and participation in school and class functions.

e. Increase or maintain at a high level the amount of family centered activities.

f. Maintain a high level of expectation for academic achievement for child.

g. Raise or maintain at a high level the parents' feelings of interpersonal adequacy, competence.

h. Increase or maintain at a high level parents' skill in relating to school, participating in PAC.

i. Increase or maintain at a high level the feelings of control over the educational life of the child.

2. For children.

a. Raise or maintain at a high level the level of self-esteem.

b. Increase or maintain at a high level cognitive development, ability to ask questions, to know evidence, manipulate materials, use abstract language, solve concrete problems, organize information.

c. Increase or maintain at a high level achievement motivation.

d. Increase or maintain at a high level initiative and self-direction.

3. For classroom and school.

a. Increase or maintain at a high level teachers' skill in classroom management of other adults (paraprofessionals and parents).

b. Increase the teachers' skill in constructing focused curriculum materials (home learning tasks) and use of desirable teaching behaviors.

c. More individualized instruction through use of other adults, and home learning tasks.

d. Increase parent educator's skill in using desirable teaching behaviors in working with parents.

e. Increase parent educator's time in working with individual children and small groups.

f. Increase parent educator's skill in planning with teacher for both home and school activities.

g. Increase or maintain at a high level parent educator's self-esteem and sense of internal control.

h. Help teachers' morale.

i. Provide a model of home-school relationships for subsequent use in the school system.

It will be noted that, in keeping with our rationale, the changes are not only in home but in school, and in the relationship between them.

III. Procedures

A. Training Programs - Communities

One of the major continuing functions of the model sponsor has been to provide training activities for those people implementing the model in our eleven (11) Follow Through communities. The primary people receiving the training have been the teacher-P.E. teams, and PAC chairpersons and parents, with the major training emphasis placed on all activities related to the home visit and the relationship of the home to school.

All other support people (coordinator and staff, task specialist, principals, evaluation specialist, administrators) always have been part of the training program so that they may know what the sponsor was trying to accomplish, and to gain their support in accomplishing the goals of the model in their community. Until 1972, major training activities were conducted at the home shop in Gainesville at the University of Florida during the summer under the sponsorship of EPDA funds. When EPDA funding ended our workshops were reduced to two-three day sessions for coordinators, evaluation people, PAC chairpersons and parents and administrators. The emphasis was on reporting on what progress was being made in our program and planning for future activities.

Two workshops were held in Gainesville - July 16-18, 1973 and November 14-15, 1973 - for the eleven communities participating in the Florida Parent Education Follow Through Model to plan for the future of the project upon phase-out of federal funding.

The purpose of the July 16-18 workshop was to explore with community power figures ways of continuing the Florida Model once federal funds were withdrawn. The workshop was attended by superintendents, school board members, project coordinators, PAC chairpersons, evaluation specialists and parents. See Appendix G for the agenda and list of participants.

The November 14-15, 1973 workshop was designed to assist each of our Follow Through communities develop its first phase-out proposal in a new format and to meet what we were led to believe was an absolutely rigid December 15 deadline which never materialized. Parts of

the workshop were devoted to writing new letters of agreement and planning appropriate phase-out activities.

Mrs. Rose Koury (U.S.O.E., Follow Through) assisted our communities with the new proposal format. No major changes in objectives for our model were made. Appendix H contains the agenda and a list of participants.

B. Training Programs - On-Site Workshops

On-site workshops of one week duration were held prior to the opening of school in each community for all Follow Through personnel. One or more of the following Florida faculty served as a consultant in the listed community for at least two days during the preservice workshop.

On-Site Preservice Workshops
August, 1973

Chattanooga	Dr. Ware	August 13-14
	Dr. Newman	August 20-21
Houston	Dr. Bessent	August 13-15
Jacksonville	Dr. Greenwood	August 15-17-29
	Mrs. Olmsted	August 17
Jonesboro	Dr. Webb	August 30-31
	Mrs. Olmsted	August 30-31
Lawrenceburg	Dr. Greenwood	August 21-22
Philadelphia	Dr. Guinagh	August 20-21
Richmond	Dr. Breivogel	August 20-22
	Dr. Bessent	August 23-24
Tampa	Dr. Packer	August 29-30
Winnsboro	Dr. Johnson	August 6-7
Yakima	Dr. Ware	August 20-23

The training programs for these local, on-site workshops were designed to review the model with experienced teachers and P.E.s and to introduce the model to new teachers and P.E.s. Training was provided in some of the following areas: use of DTBs, teacher-parent educator roles, preparation and procedures for parent educators to use on home visits and local procedures for linkage between the educational component, comprehensive services, and PAC activities. However long the community has been with us we have not assumed that the program is ready to be fully implemented at termination of the workshop in new or old classrooms. We see our program as developmental. The preservice workshops are designed to enhance the skill of people who have been involved with us over a period of time and to provide the entry skills for those entering for whom it is the first year. It is also a time to get feedback from those people operating the program.

C. In-service Program Support - School Year On-Site

1. Each community has a liaison officer. He communicates with the community, and arranges for the consultant's visit, briefs the consultant on the local situation, and then receives a report from him about his trip. (See Appendix I for memo from G.E. Greenwood and W.F. Breivogel to Liaison Officers and Consultants in reference to Consulting Procedures, 1973-74 and Job Description of the Florida Policy Advisory Committee Consultant). (For Liaison Officers' final report on their communities, see Appendix J.)

The Liaison officer's role is a critical one, since to a great degree our program is responsive to changing local conditions and helping implement the model throughout the school year. Each liaison officer is a full-time regular faculty member of the College of

Education, University of Florida, who is released by his department from teaching one course during the academic year for this responsibility. (Normal course load in Foundations is seven (7) five-hour courses; in Elementary Education, eight (8) four-hour courses). He is a basic member of the policy and administrative team. The liaison officers and consultants meet regularly as a "Follow Through group" to discuss the overall program, issues and problems of each community, plans for the future. The inclusion of all liaison officers and consultants in the decision-making process means that the Florida Program is a basic commitment of the Research and Development program of the College of Education, with strong implications for teacher education. The liaison officers are listed below:

Community	Liaison Officer	Rank	Department
Chattanooga	Dr. W. Ware	Assoc. Prof.	Foundations
Houston	Dr. H. Bessent	Asst. Prof.	Foundations
Jacksonville	Dr. G. Greenwood	Assoc. Prof.	Foundations
Jonesboro	Dr. R. Webb	Asst. Prof.	Foundations
Lac du Flambeau	Dr. E. Jester	Assoc. Prof.	Foundations
Lawrenceburg	Dr. G. Greenwood	Assoc. Prof.	Foundations
Philadelphia	Dr. B. Guinagh	Asst. Prof.	Foundations
Richmond	Dr. W. Breivogel	Asst. Prof.	Elementary
Tampa	Dr. A. Packer	Assoc. Prof.	Elementary
Winnsboro	Dr. S. Johnson	Asst. Prof.	Elementary
Yakima	Dr. W. Ware	Assoc. Prof.	Foundations

2. We provide two days of consultant service a month to the local community (see Appendix I which describes the basic ingredients of the consultant visit). The consultant schedule of visits which were made in 1973-74 follows. It will be noted that the pattern of visits varies by community, and that "two days a month" is a guide.

Follow Through
Consultant Visit Chart - 1973-74

	August	September	October	November	December
Chattanooga	Ware 13-14 Newman 20-21	NONE	Olmsted 15-16 Bracey 7-9	Ware 7-9	Breivogel 10-11
Houston	Bessent 13-15	NONE	Ware 24-26	NONE	Bessent 31
Jacksonville	Greenwood 15,17,29 Olmsted 17	NONE	Ware 18-19 Bracey 17-19	Breivogel 29 Greenwood 29 Bracey 28-30	Greenwood 11-12
Jonesboro	Webb 30-31 Olmsted 30-31	NONE	Greenwood 15-16	Webb 27-28	NONE
Lac du Flambeau	NONE	Ware 5-7 Jester 5-7	NONE	NONE	NONE
Lawrenceburg	Greenwood 21-22	NONE	Fillmer 2-3	Bernard 6-7	Ware 4-5
Philadelphia	Guinagh 20-21	NONE	Webb 15-16 Bessent 15-16	Greenwood 19-20 Bracey 18-20	Breivogel 18-19
Richmond	Breivogel 20-22 Bessent 23-24	NONE	Packer 3-4	Breivogel 7-8	Ware 13-14
Tampa	Packer 29-30	Olmsted 25-26	Johnson 15-16	Packer 7	NONE
Winnsboro	Johnson 6-7 Bracey 8-10	Ware 18-19	Bernard 22-23	Johnson 1	Johnson 4-5
Yakima	Ware 20-23	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE

Follow Through
Consultant Visit Chart - 1973-74

	January	February	March	April	May	June
Chattanooga	Ware 31,1	NONE	Ware 1,19 Bracey 3-5	Guinagh 2-3	Ware 3	NONE
Houston	Bessent 2-3. Johnson 21-23	NONE	Newell 27-29	NONE	Newman 15-17 Bessent 15-17 Bracey 14-17	NONE
Jacksonville	Bessent 24-25 Breivogel 28	Johnson 21-22	Breivogel 20 Bracey 12-15	Webb 18 Bracey 8-11	Greenwood 23	NONE
Jonesboro	Guinagh 21-22	Webb 18-19	NONE	NONE	Newman 6-7	Olmsted 4-5 Webb 4-5
Lac du Flambeau.	Olmsted 17-18	Ware 20-22 Bracey 19-23	Ware 20-22	Greenwood 8-9	Jester 16-17	NONE
Lawrenceburg	Greenwood 8-9	Breivogel 5-6 Bracey 4-6	NONE	Shea 2-3	Greenwood 7-8	NONE
Philadelphia	Jester 21-22	Johnson 25-26	Guinagh 18-19	NONE Bracey 29,30	Fillmer 13-14 Bracey 1-3	NONE
Richmond	NONE	NONE	Bessent 7-8	Packer 3-4	Breivogel 1-3	NONE
Tampa	Packer 14 Olmsted 30	Breivogel 15	Guinagh 1 Johnson 18-19 Packer 28	NONE	Packer 20,22,29	NONE
Winnsboro	Packer 21-22	Newman 18-19	Shea 18-19	Greenwood 29-30	Johnson 22-23	NONE
Yakima	Johnson 14-16	Olmsted 25-27	NONE	Jester 10-12	Ware 15-17	NONE

In communities such as Yakima and Lac du Flambeau, distance as well as local needs dictated a different pattern. The communities and liaison officers develop the best local approach.

3. During 1973-74, videotapes were again used as a part of the inservice training procedure. Each community was asked to send to the sponsor one videotape each month depicting teacher-parent educator planning sessions, home visits, follow-up sessions after home visits, or sponsor related classroom episode. Feedback on these videotapes was provided in one of two ways: (1) the next consultant returned the tape to the community and discussed its contents during his visit, or (2) the liaison officer communicated the feedback information by letter.

In addition to videotapes, each community sent copies of its home learning activities, the weekly observation reports of parent educators, and attitude and questionnaire information about the home. These data are used for program evaluation and to assist in planning in inservice training. Computer printouts of Parent Educator Weekly Report data provide the basic feedback to communities during the year. These printouts contain such information as: (1) percentage of possible home visits that are completed, (2) percentage of parents working in the classroom, and (3) percentage of home learning activities being used which were developed by parents. These data plus feedback data on pre- and post-testing are provided to the community both by mail and during consultant visits. All of these materials are explained to the Policy Advisory Committee, and no data are collected which have not been reviewed by that committee.

99019

The program sponsor, the local education agency, and the parents are seen as a partnership team in which information flows back and forth, with the main objective being to enhance the total development of the child. In our model, curriculum content decisions are entirely the prerogative of the local community. The program sponsor attempts to enable teachers and parent educators to translate their content goals into effective learning materials to be used at home and in school to achieve what it is the parents and school wish to achieve.

The program sponsor, through the continuous contact of liaison officers and consultants strive to keep all elements of the program on target, and to facilitate the development of the program. The role of the Institute is more than consulting services; it provides direction, support, and information, as well as some elements of the evaluation program. Within the framework of the program, however, there is considerable flexibility to meet community needs.

4. In the area of leadership of the Florida Parent Education Follow Through Program, 1972-73 was a year of transition. As Dr. Ira J. Gordon would be on sabbatical leave during 1973-74, he worked closely with and gradually turned the leadership over to the three persons who would direct the program during his absence, Dr. Gordon Greenwood, Dr. William Ware, and Dr. William Breivogel, with Dr. Greenwood assuming the major role. The position of Project Manager was filled by Pat Olmsted who supervised all Follow Through personnel and coordinated the flow of data between the communities and the sponsor. The central office staff also consisted of several graduate and doctoral students, and student assistants and non-academic personnel for data processing.

D. PAC Activities

PAC activities are central to the program sponsor's goals and implementation activities. We view parent education far more broadly than what happens on the visit and/or a parent's involvement as classroom worker or volunteer, although these are fundamental to the program. We believe that parent education includes helping parents influence the institutional structure, curriculum and educational program of the school.

During 1973-74, we continued to keep PACs informed of our consulting activities by sending the PAC chairperson the same consulting letter that is sent to the project coordinator and by arranging consulting visits so that they corresponded with monthly PAC meetings. We continued to involve PAC in decision-making about program and evaluation through PAC attendance at our planning conference in November, 1973, and at our summer workshop for coordinators and administrators in the summer of 1973.

In an effort to further strengthen all our PACs, we provided the consulting services of Mr. James Bracey, a former Richmond PAC chairman. Mr. Bracey made visits to seven of our eleven communities during 1973-74 as follows:

1. Winnsboro, August 8 - 10, 1973
2. Chattanooga, October 7 - 9, 1973 and March 3 - 5, 1974
3. Jacksonville, October 17 - 19, 1973; November 28 - 30, 1973 March 12 - 15, 1974 and April 8 - 11, 1974
4. Philadelphia, November 18 - 20, 1973 and April 29 - May 3, 1974
5. Lawrenceburg, February 4 - 6, 1974
6. Lac du Flambeau, February 19 - 23, 1974
7. Houston, May 14 - 17, 1974

He assisted PACs in such areas as:

1. Helping PAC officers understand their roles;
2. Helping parent educators to understand PAC and encourage parent involvement;
3. Organizing and reorganizing PAC committees;
4. Organizing and reorganizing both city-wide and local school PACs;
5. Planning various PAC sponsored activities and regular meetings;
6. Establishing election procedures and drafting of by-laws;
7. Developing more efficient ways of spending PAC funds.

A job description for the Policy Advisory Committee Consultant follows (see Appendix I).

E. Evaluation Procedures

The 1973-74 year was the first year that the Florida Parent Education Program Sponsor operated under the revised evaluation plan which called for the model sponsor to assume full leadership in evaluation. As such, much time was spent working through unexpected difficulties which seemed to appear with great regularity. In addition to managing the new system for data flow and associated problems, evaluation activity consisted of instrument revision and work on the master file.

Instrument construction and revision was confined to three areas: A Parent Interview, the Parent Education Cycle Evaluation (PECE), and the Desirable Teaching Behavior (DTB) identification task. A parent interview had been constructed and used with parents in a local project in 1971-72. This interview format was revised and used again locally in 1972-73. As a part of the 1973-74 evaluation, this interview was revised extensively and then administered to parents in two of the regular Follow Through project sites. The second instrument-related activity concerned the procedures for administering the PECE. These procedures were revised to yield additional data which had not been seen as necessary at the time when the 1973-74 proposal was written. The third instrument related activity concerned the development of the DTB identification task. When the 1973-74 proposal was submitted on February 15, 1973; it had been anticipated that the Sponsor would develop a videotape containing short segments of interaction depicting each of the DTBs. After much effort, it became evident that the professional and technical expertise to produce such a tape was not

available. Thus, the plan of the evaluation was redesigned, and a paper-and-pencil format was adopted. Verbal statements characterizing the various DTBs were generated and field-tested extensively. On the basis of preliminary results, statements were reworded. During the attempt to build parallel forms, it was noted that there was a warm-up effect. In order to compensate for differences since some communities had been practicing on a similar format, two forms were devised: a short form and a long form. The short form was used for practice and the long form for reporting results.

Another major task for the 1973-74 involved work on setting up a master file for Sponsor data. When the Florida Parent Education Program began operation in 1968, the data files were not set up to run the kinds of analyses which are currently needed. In subsequent years, different project staff maintained different types of files. Thus, when the staff began the job of building a master file using the child as the unit of record, little bits of data were pulled together from various places. If then became evident that there had accumulated over the years a large number of coding errors. The staff is currently correcting as many of these errors as possible and a "complete" master file is anticipated during the fall.

The last major task of the 1973-74 year has been the processing of data from 1973-74 and the preparation of this annual report. For purposes of continuity, the basic organization of the presentation of results shall parallel the structure of the 1973-74 proposal. In that proposal, objectives were stated for the major "targets" of the program: Parents, Children, Teachers, and Parent Educators. In general, all

00021

communities were responsible for providing a basic set of data, and additional data were collected in selected projects. Results will be reported by target and by objective. Also, results will be reported for the entire program and for individual communities. When individual community data become extensive, tables will be included in Appendices.

Parents

Parents, as the primary target of the Florida Parent Education Program, may be involved in the program in a variety of ways. Such involvement must be assessed appropriately. This evaluation focuses on teaching behavior, involvement in Policy Advisory Committee, classroom volunteering, participation in the home visit program. Additional data include an examination of vertical diffusion effects, changes in the home environment, changes in parent self concept, and knowledge of the Desirable Teaching Behaviors.

Objective A.1

A. By the end of the 1973-74 school year, a randomly selected sample of mothering ones will demonstrate an increased use of at least one DTB in teaching their children, as measured by the Parent Education Cycle Evaluation (PECE), pretest-posttest.

B. A randomly selected sample of Follow Through mothering ones will demonstrate a significantly higher use of DTBs in teaching their children than will a sample of comparison mothering ones.

Initially, it was planned to collect data relating to these two objectives in each of four communities. However, because of the complexity of PECE data collection in terms of time, expense and

number of people involved, the decision was made to gather data for objective A1 (a) and A1 (b) separately, involving two of the four PECE communities in each objective. The design, data collection and results for objective A1 (a) will be presented first followed by the same for A1 (b).

A1.(a) The design for objective A1 (a) was revised for 1973-74. As in previous years the sampling model for this objective was three-stage cluster sampling. First,six teachers were randomly selected, then one of the two associated parent educators was randomly selected. For each of the six parent educators selected, four mothers were randomly selected from the "population" of mothers regularly visited by the parent educators. In previous years the following videotapes were filmed with this sample: (A) 6 teacher-parent educator planning sessions, (B) 24 parent educator-mothering one teaching sessions, and, (C) 24 mothering one - child teaching sessions. For 1973-74 the decision was made to divide the sample of mothering ones into two groups, one group in which each mothering one was taught the task by a parent educator and one group in which each mothering one was not taught the task by a parent educator.

The number and type of videotapes filmed in both community P and community T for the 1973-74 pretest were as follows:

6 teacher-parent educator planning sessions
12 parent educator-mothering one teaching sessions
12 mothering one - child teaching sessions - with mothering one being P.E. taught for this particular task
12 mothering one - child teaching sessions - with mothering one being not P.E. taught for this particular task

All mothering ones were from 'qualified' families and had children in Follow Through (FT) classrooms. The videotapes were filmed locally and

then sent to the sponsor for observation, coding and analysis. Several observation systems were used with the videotapes, but only the data relating to the DTBs will be reported here. The DTB observation system involved two independent viewings of each videotape with frequency counts for each DTB being made. The two observers then compared their counts and resolved differences by observing the videotape a third time. Five undergraduate students comprised the pool of DTB observers and a schedule was developed so that each possible pair of students observed a certain number of the set of tapes. Periodically all five students watched the same tape independently and compared counts to insure that they were all observing in the same way.

Following the collection of the pretest data for objectives A1 (a) and A1 (b) certain data collection problems became evident in one of the communities in the A1 (b) sample,and consequently this community was eliminated from the post-test sample. Since A1 (b) was an objective specifically requested by Washington, the decision was made to move community T to the sample for objective A1 (b) for the post-test. Thus, post-test data collection for objective A1 (a) occurred only in community P.

For post-test data collection in community P the decision was made to have all mothering-ones be Non-P.E.-taught to provide data to look at: (1) how mothering ones who were taught a task earlier in the year would teach this same task later in the year if it were not taught to them the second time, and (2) how mothering ones who were not taught the task either time would change their teaching behavior during the year. Thus, the post-test data for objective A1 (a) consisted of 24 videotapes of mothering one - child teaching sessions with no

mothering ones being taught the task by a parent educator. These post-test videotapes were locally filmed and sent to the sponsor for observation, coding and analysis.

The home learning task selected for the PECE involved reading the book Whistle For Willie by Ezra Jack Keats. In the pretest P.E.-taught condition the three types of sessions (teacher-parent educator- parent educator-mothering one, mothering one - child) were conducted as usual but with this task instead of one locally developed. In the non-P.E. - taught condition standard instructions were read to the mothering one before she was asked to read the book with her child. In both conditions the mothering one was provided with a sheet giving general suggestions for doing the task. Appendix F contains a copy of the standard instructions as well as a copy of the sheet of suggestions given to the mothering one.

The data most appropriate to objective A1 (a) is from the sample of mothering ones in community P who were in the non-P.E. taught condition for both the pretest and the post-test. There were twelve mothering ones in this sample on the pretest and ten of them were still available for the post-test. Of these ten, seven showed an increase of at least one DTB, two showed no change, and one showed a decrease. Using the sign test on these data $p < .05$. Thus, it can be concluded that in community P a randomly selected sample of mothering ones did demonstrate an increased use of at least one DTB in teaching their children.

Other data available from the revisions made to objective A1 (a) are the number of DTBs used on the pretest by mothering

ones in the two conditions in the two communities. The means and standard deviations for the number of DTBs used by P.E.-taught and non-P.E. taught mothering ones in communities P and T are:

	$\bar{x}$	s .d.
Community P		
PE-taught	4.42	1.73
Non-PE-taught	2.17	1.36
Community T		
PE-taught	3.67	1.64
Non-PE-taught	3.42	1.62

In both communities mothering ones in the PE-taught condition used more DTBs than did the mothering ones who were non-PE-taught. This might be expected since the mothering ones in the first condition had the task taught to them and had the opportunity to model the behavior of the PE. However, the size of the difference between the mean scores for the two groups is large in community P and small in community T. In community P, mothering ones who were PE-taught used significantly more DTBs than did mothering ones who were non-PE-taught ($t=5.50$, $p<.01$). In community T the difference in the number of DTBs used by the two groups of mothering ones is not significant.

Another type of data available is the number of DTBs covered in each of the three types of sessions in the PE-taught condition on the pretest. The mean number of DTBs covered in the teacher-PE, PE-mothering one, and mothering one - child sessions in communities P and T are:

	Community P	Community T
Teacher - PE	4.83	4.00
PE - Mothering one	4.83	3.25
Mothering one - Child	4.42	3.67

In both communities the number of DTBs covered by

teachers is larger than that covered by mothering ones. In community P the PEs cover the same number of DTBs as the teachers, while in community T the PEs cover fewer DTBs than the mothers. None of the differences in number of DTBs covered within either community is significant.

Another interesting thing which can be noted in these figures is that in all three types of sessions community P persons cover more DTBs than do community T persons. Whether this is due to differences in program implementation or to differences in community characteristics is impossible to ascertain with the data at hand.

One final set of data relating to the revision of objective A1 (a) needs to be presented. In community P a group of mothering ones were videotaped at two points during the year, on the pretest they were PE-taught and on the post-test they were non-PE-taught. There were twelve mothering ones in this group on the pretest and ten of these were available on the post-test. Of the ten mothering ones, zero increased in their use of DTBs, four showed no change in number of DTBs used, and six showed a decrease. This data would support the statement made earlier that when PE-taught, mothering ones model the teaching behavior of the PE.

A1.(b) Pretest data for objective A1 (b) were collected in communities K and O. In each community 48 videotapes were filmed, 24 of Follow Through (FT) mothering ones teaching their children and 24 of non-Follow Through (NFT) mothering ones teaching their children. All mothering ones in both the FT and NFT samples were 'qualified'. The videotapes were made locally and sent to the sponsor for observation,

coding and analysis. Several observation systems were used with the videotapes, but only the data relating to the DTBs will be reported here. The observation procedures used with the A1 (b) videotapes were identical to those used with the A1 (a) videotapes.

As mentioned earlier certain data collection problems became evident in one of the communities in the A1 (b) sample (Community O). Thus, this community was eliminated from the post-test sample for objective A1 (b) and community T was used as a substitute. The post-test data collection in community T consisted of filming 48 videotapes of 'qualified' mothering ones teaching their children. Twenty four of these mothering ones were currently in the Follow Through program and twenty four were neither currently in, nor never had been in, the Follow Through program.

The pretest and posttest data collection for Objective A1 (b) could be summarized as follows:

	Community K	Community O	Community T
Pretest	24Q FT 24Q NFT	24Q FT 24Q NFT	
Post-test	24 NQ FT 24 NQ NFT		24Q FT 24Q NFT

All FT samples for objective A1 (b) were selected by the sponsor from child roster information supplied by the communities. Criteria for the selection of the NFT sample were clearly specified by the sponsor with the actual sample being drawn locally. In each community where a NFT sample was needed there was an evaluation specialist available to assist with the selection.

The home learning task selected for objective A1 (b)

was identical to the one used for objective A1 (a). In each case, standard instructions were read to the mothering one before she was asked to read the book with her child. The mothering one was also provided with a sheet giving general suggestions for doing the task. (See Appendix F).

The pretest data for objective A1 (b) were analyzed with a multivariate analysis of variance program (BMDX63). A 2 x 2 factorial design (communities K and O, experimental and control) was used with frequency of use of the DTBs and the dependent variables. The results indicate that there is a significant difference in the frequency of use of the DTBs between communities K and O ($p<.01$) and that there are significant program effects ($p<.05$). The interaction between communities and program effects is nonsignificant.

Univariate analyses were then done to determine which of the DTBs significantly contributed to the differences found by the multivariate analysis. DTBs #1, #2, #3 and #6 were found to be contributing to both the significant difference found between communities and the significant difference found between the experimental and control samples.

These findings present the following picture. Within both community O and community K qualified FT mothering ones use significantly more DTBs than qualified NFT mothering ones. Also qualified mothering ones in community K use significantly more DTBs than qualified mothering ones in community O. The FT program is having a significant effect in both communities with the two communities operating at different levels of usage of the DTBs.

Since the post-test data were collected with qualified mothering ones in community T and non-qualified mothering ones in community K, the data for the two communities were analyzed separately using one way multivariate analysis of variance procedures. In both communities there was no significant difference between FT and NFT mothering ones with regard to the frequency of their use of the DTBs.

In summary, the data for objective A1 (b) indicate that the program is having a significant effect on the frequency of use of DTBs for qualified FT mothering ones in comparison to qualified NFT mothering ones in communities K and O, but not in community T. Also, no significant difference in frequency of use of the DTBs was found between nonqualified FT and NFT mothering ones in community K. Finally, communities O and K are operating at significantly different levels of usage of the DTBs.

Objective A.2

During the 1973-74 school year, at least 50% of a random sample of parents will attend a PAC meeting (either school or city-wide PAC).

The procedures for assessing this objective differed slightly from the procedures as outlined in the proposal. Rather than collect data on a sample, it became possible to examine the entire population. The names of the parents of each child were entered on the class rosters in all communities and sent to the Sponsor, where a master list was built for each community. Attendence sign-in sheets were sent for each city-wide and building PAC meeting. Sponsor personnel compared sign-in sheets with master lists and compiled a file for each community. The results were as follows:

Communities	Number of Meetings	Number of Families	Number Families Represented		%
K	66	799	181	(9)	24%
L	34	802	296	(3)	37%
M	16	498	125	(8)	25%
N	17	246	84	(4)	34%
O	62	960	138	(10)	14%
P	25	427	254	(1)	59%
Q	15	396	101	(7)	26%
R	10	682	61	(11)	9%
S	152	640	198	(5)	31%
T	85	729	200	(6)	27%
U	11	98	49	(2)	50%

An examination of the results indicates that only two of the eleven projects achieved the objective as stated. Six other communities reached a 25% level of proficiency, and three communities (K, O & R) failed to have 25% of the parents attend at least one PAC meeting.

Objective A.3

During the 1973-74 school year, at least 25% of a random sample of parents will attend a PAC related activity other than a PAC meeting.

As with Objective A.2, it was possible to collect data on the entire population, rather than on a random sample as specified in the objective. PAC related activities were defined as any parent activities either organized and/or sponsored by PAC approval. Sign-in sheets were forwarded to the Sponsor where evaluation personnel maintained a cumulative record for each community. The tabulated results were as follows:

Communities	Number of Activities	Number of Families	Number Families Represented		%
K	8	799	101	(6)	13%
L	93	802	174	(2)	22%
M	5	498	45	(7.5)	9%
N	18	246	37	(5)	15%
O	16	960	200	(3)	[illegible]
P	11	427	115	(1)	[illegible]
Q	2	396	26	(10)	7%
R	2	682	137	(4)	20%
S	12	640	60	(7.5)	9%

T	43	729	62	(9)	8%
U	0	-	-	-	-

The results indicate that only one community (P) achieved the objective as stated. An additional five (K, L, N, O, R) communities had more than 12.5% of the families represented at at least one PAC related activity, while four communities fell below 10% (M, Q, S, T) in PAC activity attendence. Community U did not report any PAC related activities.

Objective A.4

During the 1973-74 school year, at least 20% of a sample of parents will volunteer in the classroom.

At the beginning of the 1973-74 a variable number of classrooms was selected in each community. In each of the selected classrooms, sign-in sheets were maintained for parents who volunteered in the classroom.These sign in sheets were sent to the sponsor and tabulated cumulatively. Evidence of success is having at least 20% of the possible families having been represented at least once by a classroom volunteer. The data are presented below:

Community	Number Families in Classroom	Number Families Volunteered		%
K (no data)	-	-	-	-
L	163	74	(3)	45%
M	138	40	(7)	29%
N	133	30	(8)	23%
O	159	66	(5)	42%
P	148	70	(2)	47%
Q	183	59	(6)	32%
R	(Insufficient Data)			
S	140	81	(1)	58%
T	369	157	(4)	43%
U	150	28	(9)	19%

All communities reporting data except one (U) meet the objective.

The one exception was only short of the criterion by 1%.

Objective A.5

During the 1973-74 school year, at least 80% of the homes will be visited at least five-sixths (5/6) of the number of visits planned (eg, 30 visits out of 36) as measured by the Parent Educator Weekly Report.

Each time that a Parent Educator made a home visit, she completed a home visit observation report. Using these reports is was possible to determine how many weeks the child was enrolled in the classroom and how many times his family received a home visit. Thus, for each family, it was possible to determine the percent of possible home visits that a family actually received. Then, within each community, the number of families receiving 83% or more of the possible visits was determined. The results are as follows:

Community	Number Families	Number Receiving 83%+ Home Visits		%
K	1166	573	(1)	49%
L	842	150	(9)	18%
M	587	173	(4)	29%
N	323	31	(10)	10%
O	1171	296	(5)	25%
P	514	101	(7.5)	20%
Q	624	53	(11)	8%
R	1141	225	(7.5)	20%
S	857	334	(2)	39%
T	1195	280	(6)	23%
U	156	59	(3)	38%

The results at first glance appear extremely disturbing. Since the 83% (5/6) figure had been arbitrarily determined, a recounting of families receiving at least 60% of the possible number of home visits was completed. The results are as follows:

29036

Community	Number Families	Number Receiving 60%+ Home Visits		%
K	1166	931	(1.5)	80%
L	842	421	(8)	50%
M	587	467	(1.5)	80%
N	323	119	(11)	37%
O	1171	863	(4)	74%
P	514	339	(6)	66%
Q	624	264	(10)	42%
R	1141	524	(9)	46%
S	857	628	(5)	73%
T	1195	698	(7)	58%
U	156	123	(3)	79%

An inspection of the home visit percentage data clearly indicates that the eleven communities are falling far short of the criterion (80% receiving 5/6 of the possible home visits). In fact, in only two communities are 80% of the families receiving 3/5 of the visits. These data might suggest that more attention needs to be devoted to impressing principals and classroom teachers with the importance of making home visits.

Objective A.6

During the 1973-74 school year, parents will serve on PAC committees dealing with matters of personnel selection, proposal writing, task writing and/or task evaluation, grievances, comprehensive services, and project evaluation. Furthermore, these parents will be active in making decisions about the program.

Objective A.7

During the 1973-74 school year, the PAC will have an impact on the total school program as evidenced by contact with school board, etc.

The original intent was to deal with these two objectives separately. However, when the communities submitted their data for content analysis, it became apparent that appropriate data would not be available. Thus, data (PAC minutes, etc.) were analyzed to identify decisions that had been

made by parents which were pertinent to the Follow Through program. A descriptive analysis has been prepared which shows the number of City-wide meetings, building PAC meetings, committee meetings, and the number of decisions which could be identified from minutes. A summary statistic has been calculated by dividing the number of decisions by the number of PAC meetings (city-wide and building).

Community	Number City-wide Meetings	Number Building Meetings		Number Community Meetings	Number Decisions	Avg. No. Dec./Mtg.
K	8	35	43(3)	12	25	0.58 (8)
L	9	79	88(1)	9	11	0.12 (10)
M	11	-		14	12	1.09 (4)
N	12	-		13	24	2.00 (1)
O	9	9	18(6)	-	2	0.11 (4)
P	6	18	24(4)	14	23	0.96 (7)
Q	4	9	13(7)	1	3	0.23 (9)
R	9	0	9(8)	14	16	1.78 (2)
S	24	22	46(2)	15	48	1.04 (5)
T	15	8	23(5)	31	34	1.48 (3)
U	9	-		6	9	1.00 (6)

Examination of the PAC activity data reveals several different patterns of functioning. All communities hold city wide PAC meetings. Beyond that function, several of the larger communities appear to hold PAC meetings at the building level (e.g., K, L, P & S). Also, many of the communities appear to utilize committees to accomplish the work of the PAC. It is interesting to note that two of the largest centers (O and Q) do not seem to use committees. These two communities join community L as being the three lowest centers in terms of the number of decisions made per meeting. It may be that communities which don't use committees may spend a disproportionate amount of PAC meeting time discussing issues without reaching some sort of decision.

Additional Parent Data

Beyond the basic set of data on parents which was presented above, several communities supplied additional data to the Sponsor. Two communities (K and O) submitted data which could be used to investigate the phenomenon of vertical diffusion, a measure of family institutional change. Another measure of the home situation, the Home Environment Review (HER) was collected in communities L, Q and S. Community S also collected data on changes in parental self concept using the How I See Myself (HISM) and on parents' ability to identify the Desirable Teaching Behaviors.

Vertical Diffusion

Both communities K and O collected data which could be used to look for the possible incidence of vertical diffusion: that is, evidence concerning whether the effects of the program are extending beyond the child being served to other members of the family. Since the data were collected differently in the two communities, the data are reported separately.

Community K has an extensive program of preschool programs. Children entering the Headstart program in the Fall of 1973 were tested with the Preschool Inventory (PSI). On the basis of records, it was possible to differentiate families concerning family exposure to compensatory education. The childrens' PSI scores were classified into four groups: children coming from families with no prior exposure, children coming from families where older children had participated in Follow Through, children who had participated in a program for 3 - 4 year-olds but whose families had not participated in Follow Through, and children who had

participated in the program for 3 - 4 year-olds and whose families had participated in Follow Through. These four groups were considered as a 2 x 2 factorial design and the sex of the child was included as a third factor. Thus, the Fall 1973 PSI raw scores of 56 children were analysed as a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design with age-in-months employed as a covariate. The group sizes and adjusted means are presented below:

		3-4 Year-Old Program	No 3-4 Year-Old Program
Follow Through Family	Girls	n=6	n=9
		$\bar{x}_{ADJ} = 41.60$	$\bar{x}_{ADJ} = 48.11$
	Boys	n=8	n=5
		$\bar{x}_{ADJ} = 34.97$	$\bar{x}_{ADJ} = 49.90$
Non-Follow Through Family	Girls	n=7	n=5
		$\bar{x}_{ADJ} = 47.07$	$\bar{x}_{ADJ} = 33.88$
	Boys	n=7	n=9
		$\bar{x}_{ADJ} = 48.00$	$\bar{x}_{ADJ} = 39.45$

The results of the analysis of covariance are summarized below:

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Sex (S)	2.29	1	2.29	0.02
Follow Through (FT)	31.60	1	31.60	0.33
PreSchool Program (PS)	0.07	1	0.07	0.00
SxFT	105.72	1	105.72	1.11
SxPS	141.99	1	141.99	1.49
FTxPS	1151.11	1	1551.11	16.38
SxFTxHB	11.74	1	11.74	0.12
Error	4450.93	47	94.70	

Initially focusing on the effect of interest, FT, indicates no significant difference. However the FT x PS interaction effect is statistically significant ($p<.01$). An examination of the group means suggests some perplexing results: The children who had participated

00040

in the preschool program and whose families had received house visits through Project Follow Through appear to be functioning at the same level as the control group. Children who had either participated in the preschool program or whose families had received home visits from Follow Through (for older siblings) but not both, seem to be functioning substantially higher than the control group. One might conclude that either a pre-school program (direct experience) or Follow Through family participation (indirect experience) may improve the child's performance, but that a combination of programs is not effective. A more reasonable explanation is that a bad sample has been obtained and that perhaps the "combined" group should be disregarded. Thus, one might tentatively conclude that a family's participation in project Follow Through does improve performance on the PSI by younger siblings. This interpretation is consistent with the findings in this project based on Fall, 1972 test results and reported in the Sponsor 1972-73 Annual Report.

The vertical diffusion data supplied by community O also included the PSI as the dependent variable. Children were classified by sex, ethnic origin (Black and Mexican-American), and years of family experience in parent education (0 (control), 1, or 2). All children were low-income with previous Head Start experience and were tested as they entered kindergarten in the Fall of 1973. The PSI scores were analyzed as a 2 x 2 x 3 factorial design with age at the time of testing as a covariate. The adjusted PSI means and sample sizes are shown below:

Years of Parent Education	Blacks		Mexican-American	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
0	n=14 $\bar{x}_{ADJ}$=42.78	n=11 $\bar{x}_{ADJ}$=50.03	n=9 $\bar{x}_{ADJ}$=47.07	n=10 $\bar{x}_{ADJ}$=47.99
1	n=4 $\bar{x}_{ADJ}$=52.33	n=3 $\bar{x}_{ADJ}$=50.43	n=4 $\bar{x}_{ADJ}$=43.47	n=4 $\bar{x}_{ADJ}$=49.50
2	n=10 $\bar{x}_{ADJ}$=57.00	n=3 $\bar{x}_{ADJ}$=54.89	n=3 $\bar{x}_{ADJ}$=49.42	n=2 $\bar{x}_{ADJ}$=53.30

The results of the analysis of covariance are summarized below:

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Ethnic Group (A)	102.32	1	102.32	1.47
Sex (B)	70.62	1	70.62	1.01
Years (C)	464.02	2	232.01	3.33*
AB	21.09	1	21.09	0.30
AC	144.18	2	72.09	1.03
BC	29.84	2	14.92	0.21
ABC	188.10	2	94.05	1.35
Error	4461.44	64	69.71	

A preliminary inspection of the analysis of covariance results indicated significant differences associated only with the factor of number of years in parent education. A follow up analysis employed pair-wise comparisons to further study the data. Results indicated a significant difference only for the comparison children (0 years) versus the children whose families had been involved with parent education for a least two years (t = 2.48, $p<.01$).

On the basis of the data provided from two communities, it seems reasonable to conclude that there are vertical diffusion effects in the Florida Parent Education Program. It would appear that involvement in parent education may change the manner in which parents work with children, so that younger children in the family receive benefits indirectly from the program.

09042

Home Environment

Another way of looking at changes in the home is to interview parents about selected aspects of the home environment. The Home Environment Review is a semi-structured interview which measures 9 environmental process characteristics. Data were gathered in Communities L, Q and S on a pretest-posttest basis. These data were analyzed separately for qualified and nonqualified homes. Analyses were completed for both the communities pooled and also for communities separately. The means and standard deviations on pretest and post-test are displayed in Tables 1 and 2 for qualified and nonqualified families for total program. The individual community results have been displayed in Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 accordingly. There was no data from Community Q on non-qualified families.

Multivariate tests were completed testing the hypothesis that the nine gains were simultaneously equal to zero. Then examining the 558 qualified families for the total program, the null hypothesis was rejected (F = 7.26, 9&549df, $p<.01$). An inspection of the gains in Table 1 would suggest that the qualified families gained on Variables 2, 5, 7 and 8. When looking at the results from the 82 non-qualified families, the null hypothesis was not rejected (F = 1.34, 9 & 73df, $p>.20$).

Similar multivariate tests were completed for the qualified and non-qualified families in the respective communities. The results suggested that in Community L, qualified families gained on the HER (F=6.33, 9&382df, $p<.01$), with particular gains on Variables 2, 7, &8. The nonqualified families in Community L showed no significant changes (F=1.20, 9&49df, $p>.20$).

00043

TABLE 1

Community	Total
Qualified	X
Non-Qualified	

Means, Standard Deviations, and Gains on Nine HER Scales for Pretest and Posttest (n= 558)

Scales:
1. Expectations for Child's Schooling
2. Awareness of Child Development
3. Rewards for Intellectual Attainment
4. Press for Language Development
5. Availability and Use of Supplies for Language Development
6. Learning Opportunities Outside the Home
7. Materials for Learning in the Home
8. Reading Press
9. Trust in School

Scales

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Pre	$\bar{x}$	4.38	3.28	4.05	3.57	3.73	3.58	3.46	2.87	4.06
	s	0.58	1.06	1.00	0.93	1.32	0.99	1.01	1.35	0.96
Post	$\bar{x}$	4.39	3.50	4.14	3.58	3.93	3.69	3.71	3.22	4.14
	s	0.61	1.06	0.85	0.92	1.22	0.94	0.93	1.31	0.91
Gain		0.01	0.22	0.09	0.01	0.20	0.11	0.25	0.35	0.08

TABLE 2

Community	Total
Qualified	
Non-Qualified	X

Means, Standard Deviations, and Gains on Nine HER Scales for Pretest and Posttest (n= 82)

Scales:
1. Expectations for Child's Schooling
2. Awareness of Child Development
3. Rewards for Intellectual Attainment
4. Press for Language Development
5. Availability and Use of Supplies for Language Development
6. Learning Opportunities Outside the Home
7. Materials for Learning in the Home
8. Reading Press
9. Trust in School

Scales

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Pre	$\bar{x}$	4.54	3.18	4.21	3.72	3.79	3.82	3.71	2.95	4.02
	s	0.65	1.02	0.80	0.85	1.28	0.86	0.86	1.28	0.98
Post	$\bar{x}$	4.49	3.33	4.30	3.72	4.07	3.83	3.77	3.30	4.23
	s	0.59	1.16	0.75	1.02	1.20	0.99	0.92	1.37	0.95
Gain		-0.05	0.15	0.09	0.00	0.28	0.01	0.06	0.35	0.21

TABLE 3

Community L
Qualified X
Non-Qualified

Means, Standard Deviations, and Gains on Nine HER Scales for Pretest and Posttest (n= 391)

Scales:
1. Expectations for Child's Schooling
2. Awareness of Child Development
3. Rewards for Intellectual Attainment
4. Press for Language Development
5. Availability and Use of Supplies for Language Development
6. Learning Opportunities Outside the Home
7. Materials for Learning in the Home
8. Reading Press
9. Trust in School

		Scales								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Pre	$\bar{x}$	4.40	3.35	4.10	3.64	3.94	3.63	3.55	2.98	4.11
	s	0.56	1.06	0.90	0.94	1.22	0.99	1.00	1.32	0.97
Post	$\bar{x}$	4.42	3.59	4.24	3.69	4.11	3.78	3.85	3.37	4.23
	s	0.60	1.04	0.75	0.88	1.14	0.93	0.89	1.28	0.85
Gain		0.02	0.24	0.14	0.05	0.17	0.15	0.30	0.39	0.12

TABLE 4

Community L
Qualified
Non-Qualified X

Means, Standard Deviations, and Gains on Nine HER Scales for Pretest and Posttest (n= 58)

Scales:
1. Expectations for Child's Schooling
2. Awareness of Child Development
3. Rewards for Intellectual Attainment
4. Press for Language Development
5. Availability and Use of Supplies for Language Development
6. Learning Opportunities Outside the Home
7. Materials for Learning in the Home
8. Reading Press
9. Trust in School

Scales

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Pre	$\bar{x}$	4.62	3.31	4.29	3.78	4.00	3.89	3.79	3.26	4.03
	s	0.49	1.08	0.75	0.90	1.17	0.89	0.83	1.22	1.06
Post	$\bar{x}$	4.53	3.53	4.48	3.84	4.43	4.05	3.96	3.62	4.27
	s	0.62	1.19	0.60	1.06	0.96	0.92	0.81	1.27	1.00
Gain		-0.09	0.22	0.19	0.06	0.43	0.16	0.17	0.36	0.24

TABLE 5

Community Q
Qualified X
Non-Qualified

Means, Standard Deviations, and Gains on Nine HER Scales for Pretest and Posttest (n= 92)

Scales:
1. Expectations for Child's Schooling
2. Awareness of Child Development
3. Rewards for Intellectual Attainment
4. Press for Language Development
5. Availability and Use of Supplies for Language Development
6. Learning Opportunities Outside the Home
7. Materials for Learning in the Home
8. Reading Press
9. Trust in School

Scales

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Pre	$\bar{x}$	4.36	3.19	3.88	3.50	3.62	3.54	3.28	2.95	4.08
	s	0.48	1.09	1.20	0.94	1.19	0.99	1.03	1.33	0.85
Post	$\bar{x}$	4.35	3.36	3.90	3.54	3.93	3.60	3.42	3.00	3.88
	s	0.50	1.02	0.86	0.85	1.00	0.83	0.80	1.16	1.02
Gain		-.01	0.17	0.02	0.04	0.31	0.06	0.14	0.05	-.20

990148

TABLE 6

Community S
Qualified X
Non-Qualified

Means, Standard Deviations, and Gains on Nine HER Scales for Pretest and Posttest (n= 75)

Scales:
1. Expectations for Child's Schooling
2. Awareness of Child Development
3. Rewards for Intellectual Attainment
4. Press for Language Development
5. Availability and Use of Supplies for Language Development
6. Learning Opportunities Outside the Home
7. Materials for Learning in the Home
8. Reading Press
9. Trust in School

Scales

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Pre	$\bar{x}$	4.27	2.97	4.00	3.29	2.80	3.31	3.16	2.21	3.77
	s	0.76	0.96	1.19	0.85	1.52	0.95	0.96	1.31	1.02
Post	$\bar{x}$	4.24	3.16	3.88	3.02	2.97	3.32	3.29	2.70	4.02
	s	0.75	1.16	1.15	1.01	1.42	1.02	1.08	1.49	0.97
Gain		-0.03	.19	-0.12	-0.27	.17	.01	.13	.49	.25

TABLE 7

Community S
Qualified
Non-Qualified X

Means, Standard Deviations, and Gains on Nine HER Scales for Pretest and Posttest (n= 24)

Scales:
1. Expectations for Child's Schooling
2. Awareness of Child Development
3. Rewards for Intellectual Attainment
4. Press for Language Development
5. Availability and Use of Supplies for Language Development
6. Learning Opportunities Outside the Home
7. Materials for Learning in the Home
8. Reading Press
9. Trust in School

		Scales								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Pre	$\bar{x}$	4.33	2.88	4.00	3.58	3.29	3.67	3.54	2.21	4.00
	s	0.91	0.79	0.88	0.72	1.43	0.76	0.93	1.14	0.78
Post	$\bar{x}$	4.38	2.83	3.88	3.42	3.21	3.29	3.29	2.54	4.12
	s	0.49	0.96	0.90	0.88	1.31	0.95	0.99	1.32	0.79
Gain		0.05	-0.05	-0.12	-0.16	-0.08	-0.38	-0.25	0.33	0.12

05050

Although some of the variables indicated relatively large shifts, the elements of the variance-covariance matrix were too large to permit the identification of a significant gain.

The results from Community Q indicated no significant differences (F=1.49 9 & 83df, $p>.20$) for qualified families. There were no data from nonqualified families.

The data from qualified families in Community S indicated a significant gain on the HER (F=2.39, 9&66df, $p<.05$). An inspection of the individual variable gains in Table 6 indicates a large positive gain of variable 8 and a rather large loss on variable 4. The data for nonqualified families in community S showed no significant differences (F=0.43, 9 & 15 df, $p>.20$). This finding may be in part due to the small sample size.

Parental Self Concept

Self-concept data were sent from Community S. These data were collected in the Fall and the Spring using the How I See Myself (HISM). The instrument measures four aspects of self: Interpersonal Adequacy, Social, Physical Appearance, and Competence. The multivariate analysis indicated no significant changes in Self Concept (F=0.88, 4&12df, $p>.20$). These results may be due to the small sample size involved and run counter to results obtained in previous years. Also, these parents have been involved in the programs for several years and whatever change might be effected by participation in parent education may have taken place in previous years.

Parent Knowledge of DTB's

Community S also forwarded some data collected on 23 parents relating

to their knowledge of the DTB's. The community employed the long form used by the Sponsor. This form contained 22 items, 2 characteristic of each of the revised DTB's. The revised DTB's are as follows:

1. Get the learner to ask questions.
2. Ask questions that have more than one correct answer.
3.a. Ask questions that require more than one word as an answer.
3.b. Encourage the learner to enlarge upon his response.
4.a. Praise the learner when he does well.
4.b. Praise the learner even when he takes small steps in the right direction.
4.c. Let the learner know when he is wrong in a positive or neutral manner.
5. Get the learner to evaluate or make judgments or choices on the basis of evidence, and/or criteria; rather than by random guessing, chance, luck, authority, etc.
6. Give the learner time to think about the problem; don't be too quick to help.
7.a. Give the learner some time to familiarize himself with the task materials.
7.b. Before starting a structured learning situation, give the learner an introduction or interview.

An analysis of the results that the 23 parents were able to identify an average of 13.87 statements correctly out of a total of 22 possible with a range of (7-20). A more detailed analysis for each DTB is presented in Table 8.

Table 8
Frequency and Percentage of Parents Responding Correctly to None, One or Two Instances for Each DTB (n=23)

DTB #	None Correct		One Correct		Two Correct	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	7	30.44	8	34.78	8	34.78
2	3	13.04	6	26.09	14	60.87
3a	7	30.44	9	39.13	7	30.44
3b	6	26.09	10	43.48	7	30.44
4a	-	-	-	-	23	100.00
4b	-	-	17	73.91	6	26.09
4c	-	-	10	43.48	13	56.52
5	10	43.48	7	30.44	6	26.09
6	2	8.70	10	43.48	11	47.83
7a	3	13.04	3	13.04	17	73.91
7b	8	34.78	15	65.22	-	-

99052

The data above suggest a moderate degree of parent familiarity with the DTB's. However, the evidence indicates that more work is in order, with particular focus on DTBs #1, #3a, #3b, #4b, #5 and #7b.

Parent Interview

As noted earlier, one of the evaluation activities during the 1973-74 year was the revision of a Parent Interview which had been used previously in the Alachua County project. After revision, this interview was used to gather data in two of the communities (L & N). A complete discription of the procedures has been included in Appendix A. A summary of the conclusions has been included here. Readers interested in specific results should turn to Appendix A. The general conclusions from the interview data were as follows:

1. There was an overall favorable response towards the Follow Through program in general (See categories one and ten).
2. A majority of the Follow Through parents spend more time with their children now as opposed to before the commencement of Follow Through (See category two). Similarly, the majority of the parents stated that their participation in the program had contributed to an improvement in their children's performance in school (see category three).
3. In spite of different ecomonic backgrounds and neighborhoods, the data presented in this report serves to solidify the idea of ease of communication experienced by the parent, parent educator, teachers, and other participants involved in the Follow Through program (see categories four and five).

4. A majority of parents from both communities were pleased with the home learning activities, stating that they were suited to their children (see category six).
5. An overwhelming number of parents (89 parents - 98.9%) stated that they thought the home and school should work together in the education of their children. This serves to reinforce the applicability of the Follow Through program (see categories seven and eight).
6. Although most parents were notified in advance about PAC meetings (94%), only 61% actually attended these meetings. Suggestions regarding improvements in this area are presented in Table VI (see category nine).

Children

Children involved in an intensive program of compensatory education should reflect changes as a result of that experience. Although the Florida Parent Education Program focuses primarily on parents, children involved in the program might be expected to show gains in achievement, better attendence and changes in the self concept while participating in the program. In addition children who have participated in the Florida Model should be expected to maintain gains in achievement in the upper grades.

Objective B.1

All communities should have included achievement objectives in their 1973-74 proposals. All communities were requested to send achievement data to the Sponsor for analysis.

Since the Florida Parent Education Program is not a classroom oriented model, no program for standardized testing has been developed. In order to look at traditional classroom achievement, the Sponsor has relied on the communities to forward such data. Each community seems to have its own set of tests, and many communities use different tests at different grades. Thus, the achievement results will be presented by community.

09055

Community K

The California Achievement Test was administered to a sample for Follow Through children and non Follow Through children as a posttest only. Level 1, Form A was used with first graders and Level 2, Form A was used with second and third graders. An multivariate analysis of variance on raw scores indicated a significant FT/NFT difference in first grade (F=3.17,2 & 87 df, $P<.05$). Follow up univariate analyses indicated the NFT group scored higher (3.35 points) on Math Concepts (F=6.12, 1 & 88df, $p<05$).

There were no significant differences noted in the second and third grade results.

Community L

The data collected in this community were gathered in a FT/NFT pretest-posttest paradigm, although a variety of different tests was used across grade levels. In all analyses, gain scores were derived on dependent variables and analysed to test for equality of gain.

The Test of Basic Experience was administered to kindergarteners. An analysis of variance indicated that the FT group gained more (2.06 pts) than the NFT group (F=7.22, 1 & 145 df, $p<.05$).

The Test of Basic Experience and the Metropolitan Readiness Test were used in Grade 1. No significant differences were noted, although the FT group showed greater gains (0.78 and 2.09 pts. respectively).

The Metropolitan Achievement Test was administered in second grade. The multivariate analysis of variance using gains on the Reading, Spelling

and Arithmetic subtest as dependent variables suggested a significant FT/NFT difference (F=5.41, 3 & 54 df, $p<.05$). Follow up univariate analysis showed that FT gained more on Reading (9.93 pts. F=12.76, 1 & 56 df, $p<.05$) and more on Arithmetic (6.73 pts, F=7.17, 1 & 56 df, $p<.05$).

The SRA Achievement Test was used in the third grade. Using gains on the Reading, Language Art and Math Subtest as dependent variables, the multivariate analysis of variance indicated a significant difference (F= 2.73, 3 & 146 df, $p<.05$). Univariate analysis identified a significant difference on the Math Subtest (F=8.07, 1 & 148 df, $p<.05$) with the FT group gaining 4.35 points less than the NFT group.

Community M

The appropriate forms of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills were administered to FT and NFT children on a pretest-posttest basis. Gains scores were derived on all subtests and used as dependent variables in multivariate analyses on the respective grade levels.

There was no significant FT/NFT difference using first grade data (F=1.88, 8 & 169 df).

The multivariate analysis on second grade data indicated a significant FT/NFT difference (F=6.14, 8 & 218 df, $p<.05$). Subsequent univariate analyses showed FT 2.70 points lower on Sentences (F=7.72, 1 & 225 df, $p<.05$). FT 2.74 points lower on Passages (F=16.05, 1 & 225 df, $p<.05$), FT 1.73 points lower on Expression (F=6.76, 1 & 225 df, $p<.05$), FT 3.31 points lower on Spelling (F=14.26, 1 & 225 df, $p<.05$), FT 1.42 points lower on Mechanics (F=5.79, 1 & 225 df, $p<.05$). and FT 2.01 points

lower on Math concepts (F=10.54, 1 & 225 df).

The multivariate analysis of third grade data indicated a significant difference (F=3.08, 8 & 283 df, $p<.05$). Subsequent univariate analyses indicated the following significant difference: FT 3.09 points lower on Math Computation (F=8.07, 1 & 290 df, $p<.05$).

Community N

This community used a variety of tests in assessing student achievement. The procedures and results are reported by grade level.

In kindergarten the Slosson IQ test was given as pretest and the Anton Brenner was given as pretest and post test to FT and NFT children. The two groups were compared with respect to gains on the Anton Brenner using the initial Slosson IQ as a covariate. There was no significant difference (F=1.08, 1 & 90 df).

In first grade, the Murphy-Durrell test was given as pretest and post test as well as the Stanford Achievement Test, to both FT and NFT children. A multivariate analysis of covariance was completed using the SAT subscales as dependent variables and the Murphy-Durell pretest as a covariate. The results of this analysis indicated a significant FT/NFT difference on adjusted mean gains as follows FT gained 7.90 points less than NFT on Word Meaning (F=33.43, 1 & 99 df, $p<.05$), FT gained 4.41 points less than NFT on Spelling (F=18.13, 1 & 99 df, $p<.05$) and FT gained 5.19 points less on Word Study Skills (F=8.34, 1 & 99 df, $p<.05$).

In the second grade, the Slosson was given as a pretest and the Stanford Achievement Test was given as a pretest and posttest to both FT and NFT children. Gains scores on the SAT subtests were used as de-

pendent variables with the Slosson IQ was a covariate. The results of the analysis of covariance indicated a significant FT/NFT difference (F=2.46, 8 & 64 df, $p<.05$). Subsequent univariate analyses on adjusted means showed that FT gained 5.54 points less on Arithmetic Computation (F=10.86, 1 & 71 df, $p<.05$) and FT gained 6.23 points less on Arithmetic Concepts (F=4.49, 1 & 71 df, p .05).

In third grade, the Stanford Achievement Test was administered to FT and NFT children as pretest and postest. Gains scores on the respective subtests were derived and used as dependent variables. The multivariate analysis indicated a significant difference (F=2.28, 8 & 70 df, $p<.05$). Subsequent univariate analyses indicated that FT gained 7.45 points less than NFT on Arithmetic Computation (F=10.31, 1 & 77df, $p<.05$), and FT gained 4.16 points less on Arithmetic Concepts (F=8.67, 1 & 77 df, $p<.05$).

Community O

The data pertaining to achievement in this community were not processed by the Sponsor, but were handled by an outside contractor. In a report to the project coordinator dated August 26, 1974; the contractor stated:

With regard to the achievement of the Follow-Through children, it was decided that only children beginning kindergarten in either 1972 or 1973 would be studied in this year's analysis. At the end of each school year in Follow Through, they then would be given an appropriate achievement test, in this case the California Achievement Test. This first group of children who entered the Follow-Through in 1972 and designated as Cohort I were paired in this year's analysis with a non-Follow-Kindergarten

in 1972. An analysis of co-variance has been employed which enables the investigator to compensate for differences in abilities between entering children. The results employing this method seem to be very positive in terms of the impact on the achievement of the Follow-Through children. That is, differences in a number of the categories of the California Achievement Test have been noted in favor of the Follow-Through children. The latest results we have when analyzing the achievement data seem to indicate that the scores on the Math Computations sub-test, Math Concepts sub-test and the Math Total scores of the California Achievement Test significantly favor the Follow-Through children; that is, there are differences between the Follow-Through group and the non-Follow-Through group of children at the end of the first grade, in the areas measured by the California Achievement Test. These differences cannot be accounted for in terms of basic differences in entering abilities between the children. In other words, something in the experience they have had with regard to their education over the past two years has created a significant difference between these two groups of children. Similarly, in the areas of Reading Comprehension and Total Reading scores, the Follow-Through children bettered their control counter parts. Only in the area of Reading Vocabulary was there no difference between the Follow-Through and non-Follow-Through groups. Thus, in 3 out 4 sub-tests and in both of the total combined scores, the Follow-Through children are achieving at a higher rate than their control peers. This seems to be a highly positive and significant confirmation of the sucess of the Follow-Through program with children who have stayed in the program for at least two years.

Community P

In this community, the Metropolitan Achievement Test series was

used in grades 1, 2, & 3 with FT and NFT children as posttest only. Gain scores were derived for the respective subtests and multivariate analyses were completed at each grade level.

The analysis of firt grade data indicated no significant differences.

The multivariate analysis of the second grade data indicated a significant difference between FT and NFT children (F=5.26, 7 & 213 df, $p<.05$). Follow up analyses showed FT/NFT differences with FT gaining 2.99 points more on Word Knowledge (F=6.82, 1 & 219 df, $p<.05$), FT gaining 3.07 points more on Spelling (F=8.67 1 & 219 df, $p<.05$) FT gaining 3.48 points more on Math Computation (F=23.75, 1 & 219 df, $p<.05$). FT gaining 3.49 points more on Math Concepts (F=23.74, 2 & 219 df, $p<.05$) and FT gaining 2.70 points more on Math Problem Solving (F=11.05, 1 & 219 df, $p<.05$).

The multivariate analysis on the third grade data indicated a significant FT/NFT difference (F=8.06, 7 & 205 df, $p<.05$). Subsequent univariate analyses showed that FT gained 4.37 less on Language (F=10.66, 1 & 211 df, $p<.05$).

Community Q

The California Achievement Test was administered to students in grades 1-3. The data sent to the Sponsor included only FT children and the scores are not reported as raw score pretest/posttest comparisons yield little information. However- these data have been coded and put in the master file for later "within community" correlational analyses.

Community R

The Stanford Achievement Test series was used to posttest Follow

Through children in grades 1, 2 & 3. These data alone have no interpretation, but they have been placed in the master file for later correlational analyses.

Community S

The data for this community were handled by an outside contractor and raw data did not arrive in time to be processed and included in this report. The following remarks have been based on the contractors report to the LEA.

The California Achievement Test series was administered as a posttest in Grade 1 and as both pretest and posttest in Grades 2 & 3. The Spring 74 results for grade 1 indicated an average grade placement of 1.08 in Reading Vocabulary; 1.58 in Reading Comprehension; 1.51 in Math Computation; and 1.49 in Math Concepts.

The pretest/posttest comparison of grade equivalent scores for Grade 2 showed 0.91 gain in Reading Vocabulary, 0.59 gain in Reading Comprehension, 0.94 gain in Math Computation, and 0.96 gain in Math Concepts and Problem Solving.

The same comparisons for FT children in Grade 3 showed a 0.73 gain in Reading Vocabulary, a 0.71 gain in Reading Comprehension, a 1.04 gain in Math Computation, and a 1.06 gain in Math Concepts and Problem Solving.

Community T

The Metropolitan Achievement Test series was used in Grades 1, 2 and 3 with both FT and NFT children as a posttest only, in most cases.

In Grade 1, the Metropolitan Readiness Test was given as a pretest and the Metropolitan Achievement Test - Primary I given as a posttest. The multivariate analysis of covariance was used to compare the FT and NFT groups on the subtests of the achievement battery with readiness scores covaried out. The results of this analysis indicated no significant FT/NFT difference (F = 2.98, 2 & 136 df).

In Grade 2, the Primary I battery was used as a pretest and the Primary II battery was used as a posttest. It was decided to compare the FT and NFT groups with respect to the posttest only. The results of the multivariate analysis indicated no significant FT/NFT difference (F=1.65, 6 and 500 df).

In Grade 3, the Primary II achievement battery was used as both pretest and posttest with FT and NFT children. Gains scores were derived for the respective subscales and were used to compare the FT and NFT groups for equivalent gains. The results of the multivariate analysis suggested a significant FT/NFT difference (F=4.87, 6 & 348 df, $p < .05$). Follow up univariate analyses identified significant differences on Word Analysis (F = 11.66, 1 & 353 df, $p < .05$) and Reading (F=14.67, 1 & 353 df, $p < .05$) with FT gain 2.71 and 3.49 points less, respectively.

Community U

The Stanford Achievement Test series was used as pretest and posttest in Grades 1, 2 and 3 with FT children only. The data were reported in grade equivalent scores and mean gains will be reported here.

The first grade children demonstrated the following average gains: Word Reading, 0.66; Paragraph meaning, 0.50; Vocabulary, 0.26; Spelling, 0.87; Word Study Skills, 0.89; and Arithmetic, 0.78.

09063

The second grade children demonstrated the following average gains: Word Meaning, 0.79; Paragraph meaning, 0.84; Science/Social Studies Concepts, 0.74; Spelling, 1.37; Language, 0.78; Arithmetic Computation, 1.25; and Arithmetic Concepts, 0.70.

The third grade children demonstrated the following average gains: Word Meaning, 0.73; Paragraph Meaning, 0.83; Science/ Social Studies Concepts, 0.36; Spelling, 1.00; Language, 0.22; Arithmetic Computation, 0.63; and Arithmetic Concepts, 0.52.

09964

Objective B.2

During the 1973-74 school year, a randomly selected sample of Follow Through children will have fewer absences from school than will a similar sample of non-Follow Through children.

Data sent in from the community included average daily attendance (ADA) and average daily membership (ADM). However, data from the communities were received in various formats and had to be treated accordingly. For each community a statistic of ADA/ADM was developed as a measure of attendence for both Follow Through children and comparison children. The results were as follows:

Community	Follow Through Classes	Comparison Classes
K	.9084	.9028
L	.9335	.9146
M	.9210	.9287
N	.9422	.9502
O	.8986	*
P	.9271	.9328
Q	*	*
R	.9023	*
S	.9090	.8920
T	.9077	.9247
U	.9302	*

* Indicates No Data

An initial examination of these data is discouraging. Of the seven communities reporting data on comparison classrooms, only three communities reported data showing that Follow Through children attended school more regularly. Although this finding is statistically non-significant ($p > .10$), some explanation must be offered. One possible explanation is that the sponsor did not select the classrooms to be monitored and thus the sample may not adequately reflect the population. Some of the comparison children are middle class. A second possible explanation

relates to the difficulty of identifying adequate comparison classes, partially reflected in five communities having submitted no data. Of course the possibility remains that Follow Through children do not attend school as often as their non Follow Through counterparts, although this finding is contradicted by the data reported in the Abt Associates Interim Report (March, 1974). It should be noted that all attendance figures reported might be considered adequate.

Objective B.3

All communities were to have stated an objective in the 1973-74 proposal concerning self concept as measured by the five factors of the I Feel Me Feel (IFMF).

The I Feel Me Feel is a multifactor scale measuring five dimensions of the self concept: General Adequacy, Peer, Teacher - School, Academic, and Physical. This instrument was administered on a pretest-posttest basis by local personnel to samples of children selected by local community personnel. The results were forwarded to the Sponsor for coding and analysis. The results have been analyzed separately for the qualified and non-qualified children in each community by grade level. Due to their extensive nature, the pretest and post-test means and standard deviations and associated gains have been tabled in Appendix D. Multivariate tests were completed where possible to test the hypothesis that changes on the five measures were all zero. The results are summarized in Table 9.

TABLE 9

Summary of Results from the IFMF

Community	Grade	Q/NQ	n	Multivariate F	Dimensions of Change
K	K	Q	37	1.26(n.s.)	--
K	K	NQ	15	1.33(n.s.)	--
L	K	Q	21	10.61(p<.01)	All (+)
L	K	NQ	4	(insufficient data)	--
L	1	Q	11	"	--
L	1	NQ	3	"	--
L	2	Q	9	"	--
L	2	NQ	1	"	--
L	3	Q	25	0.59(n.s.)	--
L	3	NQ	4	(insufficient data)	--
M	1	Q	16	0.73(n.s.)	--
M	1	NQ	9	(insufficient data)	--
N	K	Q	32	1.49(n.s.)	--
N	K	NQ	24	5.50(p<.01)	GA, Phy (both +)
N	1	Q	31	1.98(n.s.)	--
N	1	NQ	22	2.35(n.s.)	--
N	2	Q	28	1.67(n.s.)	--
N	2	NQ	33	1.93(n.s.)	--
N	3	Q	27	0.99(n.s.)	--
N	3	NQ	31	1.16(n.s.)	--
O	K	Q	156	1.27(n.s.)	--
O	K	NQ	44	0.73(n.s.)	--
O	1	Q	185	0.54(n.s.)	--
O	1	NQ	34	1.24(n.s.)	--
O	2	Q	183	5.96(p<.01)	GA(-), P(-), A(-)
O	2	NQ	60	0.99(n.s.)	--
O	3	Q	175	2.51(p<.05)	All (-)
O	3	NQ	40	0.79(n.s.)	--
P	1	Q	18	0.72(n.s.)	--
P	1	NQ	16	2.11(n.s.)	--
P	2	Q	27	0.68(n.s.)	--
P	2	NQ	16	1.33(n.s.)	--
P	3	Q	26	1.84(n.s.)	--
P	3	NQ	22	3.52(p<.05)	All (-)
Q	K	Q	31	4.14(p<.01)	GA(-), P(-), TS(-)

00067

TABLE 9 (Continued)

Summary of Results from the IFMF

Community	Grade	Q/NQ	n	Multivariate F	Dimensions of Change
R	K	Q	45	1.24(n.s.)	--
R	K	NQ	19	0.96(n.s.)	--
R	1	Q	11	(insufficient data)	--
R	1	NQ	14	"	--
R	2	Q	24	0.95(n.s.)	--
R	2	NQ	12	(insufficient data)	--
R	3	Q	36	2.32(n.s.)	--
R	3	NQ	18	0.60(n.s.)	--
S	1	Q	177	3.50($p<.01$)	All (+)
S	1	NQ	47	1.19(n.s.)	--
S	2	Q	161	1.16(n.s.)	--
S	2	NQ	45	3.68($p<.01$)	P, Phy(both +)
S	3	Q	140	1.50(n.s.)	--
S	3	NQ	75	0.97(n.s.)	--
T	1	Q	17	1.81(n.s.)	--
T	1	NQ	17	1.85(n.s.)	--
T	2	Q	36	0.93(n.s.)	--
T	2	NQ	26	1.55(n.s.)	--
T	3	Q	20	3.06($p<.05$)	GA, A, Phy (all +)
T	3	NQ	22	1.51(n.s.)	--

00068

An examination of Table 9 shows very few instances of statistically significant changes in self-concept. Positive results were noted in Community L (Grade K - Qualified); Community N (Grade K - Nonqualified); Community S (Grade 1 - Qualified); Community S (Grade 1 - Qualified, Grade 2 - Nonqualified); and Community T (Grade 3 - Qualified). Negative results were noted in Community O (Grade 2 - Qualified, Grade 3 - Qualified); Community P (Grade 3 - Nonqualified); and Community Q (Grade K - Qualified). An examination of the Tables in Appendix D indicates that most of the analyses are based on small sample sizes.

In order to gain a more complete picture of the results, several additional analyses were completed. Within each community, data were merged across grades, and statistical analyses run for qualified and nonqualified separately. The results are shown in Table 10. Also, the data were combined across communities and analyses completed for qualified and nonqualified children at each grade level. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 11.

An inspection of Table 10 indicates mixed results. Positive changes in self concept are noted in Community L (Qualified children only), Community S (both qualified and nonqualified children), and Community T (qualified children only). Negative changes in self concept are noted in Community O (qualified children only), Community P (non-qualified children only) and Community Q (qualified children only). The results of the analysis for qualified children in Community R indicated varied changes: positive changes on General Adequacy and Academic and negative changes on Peer and Teacher - School.

TABLE 10

Mean Changes on IFMF (General Adequacy, Peer, Teacher-School, Academic, and Physical) for Qualified and Non-Qualified Children Within Each Community

Community	Q/NQ	n	Mean Change					Multivariate F
			G.A.	P.	T-S	A.	Phy	
K	Q	37	-0.73	1.14	-0.08	-0.78	1.62	1.26
K	NQ	15	1.00	-0.47	0.86	1.73	2.20	1.33
L	Q	66	6.11	3.92	2.48	6.86	3.83	5.44 ($p<.01$)
L	NQ	12	3.00	4.25	4.00	4.16	1.25	insufficient data
M	Q	18	-0.56	-0.28	-0.22	2.50	-0.17	0.73
M	NQ	9	2.22	3.00	-0.89	3.22	1.00	insufficient data
N	Q	118	1.14	0.55	-0.31	-0.21	0.39	1.71
N	NQ	110	-0.03	-0.28	-0.59	-0.78	-0.34	0.91
O	Q	699	-1.16	-0.86	-0.62	-1.48	-0.49	2.80 ($p<.05$)
O	NQ	178	1.27	0.76	0.57	1.30	1.23	0.82
P	Q	71	-0.56	-0.87	-1.03	-0.21	-0.69	0.78
P	NQ	54	-2.44	-2.94	-2.24	-2.35	-2.57	4.27 ($p<.01$)
Q	Q	31	-3.13	-3.87	-3.42	-1.06	-1.09	4.14 ($p<.01$)
R	Q	116	0.65	-0.81	-0.80	1.35	0.32	2.43 ($p<.05$)
R	NQ	63	1.17	1.28	-0.01	1.56	2.11	1.04
S	Q	478	1.20	0.71	0.84	1.09	0.93	2.33 ($p<.05$)
S	NQ	167	0.23	1.18	0.30	0.18	1.53	3.02 ($p<.05$)
T	Q	73	2.67	2.58	1.24	3.03	2.40	3.74 ($p<.01$)
T	NQ	65	2.47	0.98	0.84	1.54	1.35	1.38

TABLE 11

Mean Changes on IFMF (General Adequacy, Peer, Teacher-School, Academic and Physical) for Qualified and Non-Qualified Children by Grade Level

Grade Level	Q/NQ	n	Mean Change					Multivariate F
			G.A.	P.	T-S	A.	Phy	
K	Q	322	1.37	0.62	0.23	0.93	1.41	2.98 ($p<.05$)
K	NQ	102	1.51	1.57	1.70	1.78	1.84	1.45
1	Q	468	1.73	1.27	0.99	1.63	1.18	1.92
1	NQ	162	2.08	1.34	0.68	2.66	1.89	2.28 ($p<.05$)
2	Q	468	-0.76	-0.78	-0.26	-0.93	-0.32	1.50
2	NQ	197	0.29	0.45	-0.34	-0.54	0.84	3.44 ($p<.01$)
3	Q	449	-1.12	-0.97	-1.14	-0.82	-0.61	3.54 ($p<.01$)
3	NQ	212	-0.84	-0.50	-0.67	-0.72	-0.40	[illegible]

00024

An inspection of Table 11 suggests a very interesting finding: the changes in self concept seem to be positive in grades K and 1; and negative in grades 2 and 3.

Objective B.4

At the end of the 1973-74 school year, a random sample of fourth grade pupils who had experienced at least two years in Follow Through will show achievement equal to, or better than, comparable fourth grade pupils who have not experienced Follow Through.

Data were collected locally in the respective communities and sent to the Sponsor for analysis. The Sponsors data files were used to dump out all child names associated with the Florida model. Those children in the program for at least two years and comparison children who had never been in the program were retained for analysis. The analyses were completed separately for each community and the results are reported in the same fashion.

99072

Community K

The California Achievement Tests were administered to both FT and NFT pupils as pretest and posttest during the fourth grade year. Gain scores were derived on each of the four subscales, and these scores were used to compare FT graduates and NFT graduates with respect to equal gains. The results of the multivariate analysis of variance indicated no significant difference ($F = 0.92$, 4 & 53 df).

Community M

The Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills battery was administered to FT and NFT graduates as pretest and posttest during the fourth grade year. Gain scores were derived and used to compare the groups for equality of gains. The results of the multivariate analysis of variance indicated a significant FT/NFT difference ($F = 4.39$, 8 & 187 df, $p < .05$). Follow up univariate analyses showed FT graduates gaining 3.21 points less on Vocabulary ($F = 15.11$, 1 & 194 df, $p < .05$); gaining 3.83 points less on Comprehension ($F = 9.10$, 1 & 194 df, $p < .05$); gaining 2.76 points less on Expression ($F = 16.05$, 1 & 194 df, $p < .05$); and gaining 1.89 points less on Math Application ($F = 7.80$, 1 & 194 df, $p < .05$).

Community N

The Stanford Achievement Test battery was administered to fourth graders as pretest and posttest. Gain scores were derived on each of the ten subtests for FT and NFT graduates, respectively. These scores were used in a multivariate analysis of variance to compare the two groups. The results showed a significant FT/NFT difference on gain scores ($F = 5.13$, 10 & 46df, $p < .05$). Subsequent univariate analyses indicated that FT graduates gained 2.93 points less on Word Meaning ($F = 5.66$, 1 & 55 df, $p < .05$); gained 8.00 points less on Word Study Skills ($F = 14.04$, 1 & 55 df, $p < .05$); gained 23.27 points less on Language

92073

(F = 21.91, 1 & 55 df, $p < .05$); gained 16.75 points more on Arithmetic Computation (F = 14.47, 1 & 55 df, $p < .05$); gained 4.37 points less on Arithmetic Application (F = 10.91, 1 & 55 df, $p < .05$); gained 6.24 points less on Spelling (F = 13.99, 1 & 55 df, $p < .05$); and gained 3.80 points less on Social Studies (F = 5.37, 1 & 55 df, $p < .05$).

Community P

The Metropolitan Achievement Test battery was administered to fourth graders at the end of the school year. The scores of the seven subtests were used to compare children who had had FT experience to those who had not. The results of the multivariate analysis indicated a significant FT/NFT difference (F = 4.56, 7 & 171 df, $p < .05$). Follow up univariate tests showed that FT graduates gained 3.66 points less than NFT graduates on Language (F = 5.63, 1 & 177 df, $p < .05$); all other differences were non-significant.

Community S

The achievement data from this community were processed by an outside evaluation consultant. The comments below have been extracted from the report back to the community. Selected subtests of the California Achievement Test were administered to a sample of fourth grade former FT students and to an economically comparable group of NFT students. On the total Reading subtest, former FT pupils had a mean grade equivalency score of 2.55, while the NFT graduates had a mean of 2.43. On the total Math subtest, the respective scores were 3.00 and 2.66. Thus, the students who had had at least two years of FT experience performed better on both subtests.

Community T

The Metropolitan Achievement Test was given to fourth graders as pretest and posttest and the Otis-Lennon was given as a pretest.

00071

Gain scores were derived on the five MAT subtests and were used to compare FT and NFT graduates with the Otis-Lennon score used as a covariate. The results showed a significant FT/NFT difference ($F = 7.44$, 5 & 311 df, $p < .05$). Subsequent univariate analyses showed that FT graduates gained 3.58 points less than NFT graduates on Word Knowledge ($F = 12.32$, 1 & 315 df, $p < .05$); gained 3.40 points less on Math Concepts ($F = 17.61$, 1 & 315 df, $p < .05$); and gained 3.66 points less on Math Problem Solving ($F = 25.59$, 1 & 315 df, $p < .05$).

09075

Additional Child Data

In addition to the data reported on children, there were data which were not collected in all communities. In particular, the Cincinnati Autonomy Test Battery (CATB) was used to collect data on children with respect to Task Initiation, Curiosity, and Response Variability. The data reported here were collected in four communities (L, M, R & T) by the Sponsor and in one community (K) by local personnel previously trained by the Sponsor. In Communities L, M and R, data were collected only on Follow Through children. In communities K and T, data were collected on both Follow Through and comparison children. In all communities, data were collected at four different times during the year on independent random samples at each grade level. Eash sample was to have been of size 10. However, due to uncontrollable circumstance, some data were lost.

The results from the three communities in which data were collected on Follow Through children only are presented in Table 12 through Table 23. Of the 33 possible tests of statistical significance, only 5 reached significance at the .05 level. Four of these five were the artifact of having at least one cell with no variance. The remaining test may best be regarded as a Type I error.

The data from the two communities in which data were collected at four time periods on independent samples of Follow Through and comparison children were analysed differently. For each grade level-community-variable (Task Initiation, Curiosity Box, and Response Variability) combination, data were cast into a 2 x 4 factorial design and analyzed accordingly. The two levels of the first factor were

TABLE 12

Means, Standard Deviations, Sample Sizes and F-ratios Comparing Groups at Four Time Periods on the Task Initiation Subtest of the CATB in Three Communities where Data were Collected on Follow Through Children Only. (Grade K)

Community		TIME 1	2	3	4	F-ratio
L	$\bar{x}$	1.40	1.20	1.10	1.40	
	s	0.96	0.63	0.31	0.84	0.42
	n	10	10	10	10	
M	$\bar{x}$					
	s	No Data				
	n					
R	$\bar{x}$	1.40	1.40	2.70	1.30	
	s	0.70	0.97	1.49	0.95	3.92 ($p < .05$)
	n	10	10	10	10	

TABLE 13

Means, Standard Deviations, Sample Sizes and F-ratios Comparing Groups at Four Time Periods on the Curiosity Box. Subtest of the CATB in Three Communities where Data were Collected on Follow Through Children Only. (Grade K)

Community		TIME 1	2	3	4	F-ratio
L	$\bar{x}$	23.10	14.40	16.00	15.20	
	s	20.98	13.56	3.94	8.66	0.89
	n	10	10	10	10	
M	$\bar{x}$					
	s	No Data				
	n					
R	$\bar{x}$	9.40	15.50	23.80	19.30	
	s	8.07	7.64	10.27	10.89	4.27 ($p < .05$)
	n	10	10	10	10	

TABLE 14

Means, Standard Deviations, Sample Sizes and F-ratios Comparing Groups at Four Time Periods on the Response Variability Subtest of the CATB in Three Communities Where Data were collected on Follow Through Children Only. (Grade K)

TIME

Community		1	2	3	4	F-ratio
L	$\bar{x}$	10.60	8.70	10.10	6.44	
	s	4.60	3.74	4.12	1.50	2.32
	n	10	10	10	9	
M	$\bar{x}$					
	s	No Data				
	n					
R	$\bar{x}$	5.10	5.70	6.10	5.70	
	s	2.08	3.06	3.48	3.62	0.17
	n	10	10	10	10	

TABLE 15

Means, Standard Deviations, Sample Sizes and F-ratios Comparing Groups at Four Time Periods on the Task Initiation Subtest of the CATB in Three Communities Where Data were Collected on Follow Through Children Only. (Grade 1)

TIME

Community		1	2	3	4	F-ratio
L	$\bar{x}$	1.44	1.43	2.11	1.40	
	s	1.33	1.13	1.45	0.96	0.69
	n	9	7	9	10	
M	$\bar{x}$	1.75	2.11	1.88	2.25	
	s	1.39	1.45	1.36	1.28	0.22
	n	8	9	8	8	
R	$\bar{x}$	2.54	1.00	1.00	1.20	
	s	1.50	0.0	0.0	0.63	8.37 $p<.05$
	n	11	10	10	10	

TABLE 16

Means, Standard Deviations, Sample Sizes and F-ratios Comparing Groups at Four Time Periods on the Curiosity Box Subtest of the CATB in Three Communities where Data were Collected on Follow Through Children Only. (Grade 1)

Community		TIME 1	2	3	4	F-ratio
L	$\bar{x}$	16.22	10.71	20.89	15.20	
	s	15.05	7.34	3.55	7.70	1.56
	n	9	7	9	10	
M	$\bar{x}$	16.62	13.66	20.38	14.38	
	s	7.13	9.70	4.60	2.97	1.65
	n	8	9	8	8	
R	$\bar{x}$	14.45	15.20	20.60	18.80	
	s	8.39	9.52	13.22	8.14	0.88
	n	11	10	10	10	

00084

TABLE 17

Means, Standard Deviations, Sample Sizes and F-ratios Comparing Groups at Four Time Periods on the Response Variability Subtest of the CATB in Three Communities Where Data were Collected on Follow Through Children Only. (Grade 1)

TIME

Community		1	2	3	4	F-ratio
L	$\bar{x}$	9.44	9.57	12.11	8.50	1.10
	s	3.17	4.92	5.03	4.62	
	n	9	7	9	10	
M	$\bar{x}$	6.12	6.67	6.00	5.62	0.11
	s	2.41	4.77	4.47	2.67	
	n	8	9	8	8	
R	$\bar{x}$	7.27	5.30	7.30	7.90	0.86
	s	4.76	3.53	3.13	3.76	
	n	11	10	10	10	

28082

TABLE 18

Means, Standard Deviations, Sample Sizes and F-ratios Comparing Groups at Four Time Periods on the Task Initiation Subtest of the CATB in Three Communities Where Data were Collected on Follow Through Children Only. (Grade 2)

TIME

Community		1	2	3	4	F-ratio
L	$\bar{x}$	1.50	1.00	2.54	2.60	4.95 ($p<.05$)
	s	0.97	0.0	1.51	1.35	
	n	10	10	11	10	
M	$\bar{x}$	2.09	2.27	1.40	1.45	1.40
	s	1.38	1.49	0.97	0.93	
	n	11	11	10	11	
R	$\bar{x}$	2.11	2.10	2.30	1.60	0.50
	s	1.45	1.37	1.41	1.07	
	n	9	10	10	10	

TABLE 19

Means, Standard Deviations, Sample Sizes and F-ratios Comparing Groups at Four Time Periods on the Curiosity Box Subtest of The CATB in Three Communities Where Data were Collected on Follow Through Children Only. (Grade 2)

Community		TIME 1	2	3	4	F-ratio
L	$\bar{x}$	18.20	22.70	21.27	19.70	
	s	13.27	8.21	7.63	4.14	0.48
	n	10	10	11	10	
M	$\bar{x}$	19.63	20.18	15.20	17.91	
	s	10.52	10.25	8.01	4.78	0.69
	n	11	11	10	11	
R	$\bar{x}$	15.33	21.70	18.80	18.30	
	s	10.51	11.55	10.46	10.00	0.57
	n	9	10	10	10	

TABLE 20

Means, Standard Deviations, Sample Sizes and F-ratios Comparing Groups at Four Time Periods on the Response Variability Subtest of the CATB in Three Communities Where Data were Collected on Follow Through Children Only. (Grade 2)

TIME

Community		1	2	3	4	F-ratio
L	$\bar{x}$	9.80	9.20	10.45	11.60	
	s	4.71	4.34	3.98	4.35	0.56
	n	10	10	11	10	
M	$\bar{x}$	7.00	9.82	7.00	6.63	
	s	2.79	4.49	3.13	2.34	2.21
	n	11	11	10	11	
R	$\bar{x}$	10.33	7.40	10.30	10.50	
	s	3.53	4.09	3.83	5.12	1.25
	n	9	10	10	10	

TABLE 21

Means, Standard Deviations, Sample Sizes and F-ratios Comparing Groups at Four Time Periods on the Task Initiation Subtest of the CATB in Three Communities Where Data were Collected on Follow Through Children Only. (Grade 3)

TIME

Community		1	2	3	4	F-ratio
L	$\bar{x}$	2.04	2.00	2.50	No Data	0.20
	s	1.30	1.35	1.73		
	n	11	12	4		
M	$\bar{x}$	1.50	2.10	1.67	2.20	0.69
	s	0.97	1.45	1.00	1.55	
	n	10	10	9	10	
R	$\bar{x}$	2.30	1.00	1.30	1.11	4.88 ($p<.05$)
	s	1.34	0.0	0.95	0.33	
	n	10	10	10	9	

TABLE 22

Means, Standard Deviations, Sample Sizes and F-ratios Comparing Groups at Four Time Periods on the Curiosity Box Subtest of the CATB in Three Communities where Data were Collected on Follow Through Children Only. (Grade 3)

Community		TIME 1	2	3	4	F-ratio
L	$\bar{x}$	27.36	22.42	15.50		
	s	10.77	7.41	2.64	No Data	2.91
	n	11	12	4		
M	$\bar{x}$	10.20	14.90	19.00	12.10	
	s	10.75	6.24	5.57	5.97	2.46
	n	10	10	9	10	
R	$\bar{x}$	21.50	16.00	21.40	18.33	
	s	9.60	9.06	7.15	8.37	0.94
	n	10	10	10	9	

TABLE 23

Means, Standard Deviations, Sample Sizes and F-ratios Comparing Groups at Four Time Periods on the Response Variability Subtest of the CATB in Three Communities Where Data were Collected on Follow Through Children Only. (Grade 3)'

TIME

Community		1	2	3	4	F-ratio
L	$\bar{x}$	10.63	10.92	8.75		
	s	3.85	2.74	1.71	No Data	0.72
	n	11	12	4		
M	$\bar{x}$	6.60	8.90	8.33	8.70	
	s	2.68	5.92	2.64	3.80	0.68
	n	10	10	9	10	
R	$\bar{x}$	11.70	10.60	8.20	11.56	
	s	3.34	3.84	4.92	4.64	1.45
	n	10	10	10	9	

Follow Through and Comparison; the four levels of the second factor were the four rounds of testing. The means, standard deviations, and sample sizes for the eight cells respectively have been presented for the respective grade level-community-variable combinations in Tables 24 through 44. The corresponding F ratios from each analysis have been summarized in Table 45.

An examination of the results in Table 45 shows that only five of the possible 63 statistical tests indicated statistical significance. An inspection of the means in the tables corresponding to the significant F ratios suggests that the results are not consistent with research hypotheses about the model. However, these findings are supportive of the Sponsor's previous reservations about the use of the Cincinnati Autonomy Test Battery. These reservations about the instrument itself, coupled with noted difficulties with standardized administration during 1973-74, have resulted in the Sponsor Staff deciding not to use the CATB as part of the evaluation design for 1974-75.

Teachers

Although the Florida Parent Education Program is not a classroom model, its success depends in a large part on regular school personnel, particularly the teacher. Although the workhorse of the program is the parent educator, the "spark plug" of the system is the teacher. The classroom teacher is essential to the Florida Model in that she must be knowledgeable about the program, must be able to use paraprofessionals in the classroom effectively, and must be able to use her professional skills during home visit planning sessions with parent educators. In order to assess these functions of the teacher,

03089

TABLE 24

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Task Initiation Subtest of the CATB in Community K for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade K)

		TIME				
		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	1.80	2.20	2.10	1.00	
	s	1.23	5.02	1.19	0.00	1.79
	n	10	10	10	9	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	1.50	1.90	1.00	1.30	
	s	0.71	1.45	0.00	0.95	1.44
	n	10	10	8	10	
Column Mean		1.65	2.05	1.61	1.16	

TABLE 25

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Curiosity Box Subtest of the CATB in Community K for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade K)

TIME

		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	24.60	25.90	22.00	21.33	23.51
	s	8.07	5.02	10.42	8.09	
	n	10	10	10	9	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	25.90	28.00	24.12	24.40	25.68
	s	4.84	3.37	5.99	7.57	
	n	10	10	8	10	
Column Mean		25.25	26.95	22.94	22.94	

TABLE 26

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Response Variability Subtest of the CATB in Community K for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade K)

		TIME 1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	9.60	7.40	8.10	8.89	
	s	4.62	2.80	3.10	4.31	8.49
	n	10	10	10	9	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	6.80	8.40	8.37	7.90	
	s	2.78	1.78	2.67	2.73	7.84
	n	10	10	8	10	
Column Mean		8.20	7.90	8.22	8.37	

TABLE 27

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Task Initiation Subtest of the CATB in Community K for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 1)

TIME

		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	2.10	2.06	1.40	2.90	
	s	1.28	1.29	0.96	1.20	2.11
	n	10	16	10	10	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	1.10	1.00	1.62	1.86	
	s	0.32	0.0	1.06	1.23	1.41
	n	10	12	8	14	
Column Mean		1.60	1.61	1.50	2.29	

TABLE 28

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Curiosity Box Subtest of the CATB in Community K for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 1)

TIME

		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	24.90	25.81	17.20	26.70	
	s	2.60	8.76	11.58	4.27	23.93
	n	10	16	10	10	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	20.40	21.41	31.25	24.71	
	s	4.74	9.45	6.20	4.76	24.02
	n	10	12	8	14	
Column Mean		22.65	23.92	23.44	25.54	

TABLE 29

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Response Variability Subtest of the CATB in Community K for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 1)

TIME

		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	13.10	10.06	10.70	10.70	
	s	3.63	2.67	5.45	3.74	11.00
	n	10	16	10	10	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	11.80	11.00	11.12	9.57	
	s	4.89	5.53	5.06	4.20	10.75
	n	10	12	8	14	
Column Mean		12.45	10.45	10.89	10.04	

TABLE 30

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Task Initiation Subtest of the CATB in Community T for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 1)

		TIME				
		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	1.33	1.60	2.33	2.56	
	s	1.00	1.07	1.58	1.51	1.94
	n	9	10	9	9	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	1.43	2.25	1.00	1.70	
	s	1.13	1.49	0.0	1.25	1.58
	n	7	8	9	10	
Column Mean		1.38	1.89	1.68	2.11	

TABLE 31

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Curiosity Box Subtest of the CATB in Community T for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 1)

		TIME 1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	12.78	18.90	20.33	20.56	
	s	11.20	8.20	10.95	3.50	18.16
	n	9	10	9	9	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	15.14	21.12	18.22	17.20	
	s	12.89	9.01	12.67	10.27	17.97
	n	7	8	9	10	
Column Mean		13.81	19.89	19.28	18.79	

TABLE 32

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Response Variability Subtest of the CATB in Community T for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 1)

TIME

		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	7.44	8.30	7.44	8.44	
	s	3.78	4.45	3.64	4.09	7.91
	n	9	10	9	9	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	6.00	9.62	7.44	7.40	
	s	3.65	3.02	3.94	2.12	7.64
	n	7	8	9	10	
Column Mean		6.81	8.89	7.44	7.89	

S60093

TABLE 33

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Task Initiation Subtest of the CATB in Community K for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 2)

		TIME				
		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	2.27	2.10	1.75	2.00	2.07
	s	1.39	1.20	1.39	1.25	
	n	15	10	8	10	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	2.00	1.11	1.50	1.14	1.51
	s	1.41	0.33	1.00	0.38	
	n	13	9	12	7	
Column Mean		2.14	1.63	1.60	1.64	

66000

TABLE 34

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on The Curiosity Box Subtest of the CATB in Community K for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 2)

		TIME 1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	21.00	27.70	22.12	25.40	23.79
	s	9.55	3.05	8.95	5.03	
	n	15	10	8	10	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	25.46	26.56	22.17	25.43	24.73
	s	6.25	6.23	10.66	6.26	
	n	13	9	12	7	
Column Mean		23.07	27.16	22.15	25.41	

TABLE 35

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Response Variability Subtest of the CATB in Community K for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 2)

		TIME				
		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	9.93	13.50	11.88	12.30	
	s	3.57	3.53	4.36	4.64	11.67
	n	15	10	8	10	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	10.38	8.44	11.67	10.14	
	s	3.07	2.46	4.38	3.67	10.29
	n	13	9	12	7	
Column Mean		10.14	11.10	11.75	11.41	

001101

TABLE 36

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Task Initiation Subtest of the CATB in Community T for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 2)

TIME

		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	1.54	1.10	1.50	1.45	
	s	1.04	0.31	1.17	0.93	1.41
	n	11	10	12	11	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	1.33	1.40	1.27	1.40	
	s	0.82	0.97	0.90	0.97	1.35
	n	6	10	11	10	
Column Mean		1.47	1.25	1.39	1.43	

20102

TABLE 37

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Curiosity Box Subtest of the CATB in Community T for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 2)

		TIME				
		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	22.18	19.30	16.67	16.18	18.52
	s	6.78	10.45	11.79	8.53	
	n	11	10	12	11	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	15.00	22.00	15.36	20.40	18.45
	s	8.44	9.54	10.19	5.36	
	n	6	10	11	10	
Column Mean		19.64	20.65	16.04	18.19	

00103

TABLE 38

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Response Variability Subtest of the CATB in Community T for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 2)

		TIME 1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	8.27	10.40	8.08	11.00	
	s	3.58	2.99	4.52	7.69	9.38
	n	11	10	12	11	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	9.17	11.80	8.09	10.70	
	s	3.76	4.08	3.36	3.56	9.97
	n	6	10	11	10	
Column Mean		8.59	11.10	8.08	10.86	

10700

TABLE 39

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Task Initiation Subtest of the CATB in Community K for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 3)

TIME

		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	2.20	1.80	1.50	1.30	
	s	1.64	1.30	1.08	0.95	1.60
	n	5	5	10	10	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	1.33	1.44	1.60	1.22	
	s	0.52	0.73	0.97	0.44	1.41
	n	6	9	10	9	
Column Mean		1.73	1.57	1.55	1.26	

90105

TABLE 40

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Curiosity Box Subtest of the CATB in Community K for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 3)

TIME

		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	25.60	27.80	24.80	26.10	
	s	11.24	7.26	6.76	5.51	25.87
	n	5	5	10	10	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	26.33	20.44	28.00	26.22	
	s	10.95	7.18	6.65	6.57	25.24
	n	6	9	10	9	
Column Mean		26.00	23.07	26.40	26.16	

90106

TABLE 41

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Response Variability Subtest of the CATB in Community K for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 3)

		TIME				
		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	12.60	11.00	13.60	13.20	
	s	3.58	1.58	4.99	3.82	12.87
	n	5	5	10	10	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	8.67	11.44	15.90	12.56	
	s	3.39	3.04	6.06	5.88	12.56
	n	6	9	10	9	
Column Mean		10.46	11.28	14.75	12.89	

001027

TABLE 42

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Task Initiation Subtest of the CATB in Community T for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 3)

TIME

		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	1.80	1.10	1.60	1.30	1.45
	s	1.23	0.32	1.26	0.95	
	n	10	10	10	10	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	1.43	1.36	2.40	1.00	1.55
	s	1.13	0.92	1.35	0.0	
	n	7	11	10	10	
Column Mean		1.65	1.24	2.00	1.15	

90108

TABLE 43

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on The Curiosity Box Subtest of the CATB in Community T for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 3)

		TIME				
		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	19.80	20.90	20.90	19.20	20.20
	s	7.56	10.89	11.90	8.65	
	n	10	10	10	10	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	14.28	15.09	21.10	22.20	18.39
	s	13.85	9.61	14.19	8.82	
	n	7	11	10	10	
Column Mean		17.53	17.86	21.00	20.70	

00103

TABLE 44

Means, Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Four Time Periods on the Response Variability Subtest of the CATB in Community T for Follow Through and Comparison Children (Grade 3)

		TIME				
		1	2	3	4	Row Mean
Experimental	$\bar{x}$	10.10	12.40	9.60	11.30	
	s	3.75	4.53	3.60	3.13	10.85
	n	10	10	10	10	
Comparison	$\bar{x}$	9.71	9.09	8.80	13.10	
	s	4.07	4.68	3.79	4.46	10.18
	n	7	11	10	10	
Column Mean		9.94	10.67	9.20	12.20	

001140

TABLE 45

F-ratios Resulting from Analysis of CATB Data Collected in Communities K and T

Grade	Community	Variable	Hypothesis	F	Corresponding Table
K	K	Task Initiation	Program	2.01	24
K	K	Task Initiation	Time	2.24	24
K	K	Task Initiation	P x T	1.26	24
K	K	Curiosity	Program	1.84	25
K	K	Curiosity	Time	1.49	25
K	K	Curiosity	P x T	0.02	25
K	K	Response Variability	Program	0.77	26
K	K	Response Variability	Time	0.07	26
K	K	Response Variability	P x T	1.33	26
1	K	Task Initiation	Program	10.07*	27
1	K	Task Initiation	Time	2.79*	27
1	K	Task Initiation	P x T	2.53	27
1	K	Curiosity	Program	0.01	28
1	K	Curiosity	Time	0.62	28
1	K	Curiosity	P x T	7.06*	28
1	K	Response Variability	Program	0.07	29
1	K	Response Variability	Time	1.23	29
1	K	Response Variability	P x T	0.37	29
1	T	Task Initiation	Program	1.52	30
1	T	Task Initiation	Time	1.14	30
1	T	Task Initiation	P x T	2.48	30
1	T	Curiosity	Program	0.00	31
1	T	Curiosity	Time	1.25	31
1	T	Curiosity	P x T	0.38	31
1	T	Response Variability	Program	0.09	32
1	T	Response Variability	Time	0.98	32
1	T	Response Variability	P x T	0.49	32
2	K	Task Initiation	Program	4.76*	33
2	K	Task Initiation	Time	1.22	33
2	K	Task Initiation	P x T	0.71	33

99111

TABLE 45 (Continued)

F-ratios Resulting from Analysis of CATB Data Collected in Communities K and T

Grade	Community	Variable	Hypothesis	F	Corresponding Table
2	K	Curiosity	Program	0.31	34
2	K	Curiosity	Time	1.78	34
2	K	Curiosity	P x T	0.72	34
2	K	Response Variability	Program	2.84	35
2	K	Response Variability	Time	0.82	35
2	K	Response Variability	P x T	2.40	35
2	T	Task Initiation	Program	0.07	36
2	T	Task Initiation	Time	0.20	36
2	T	Task Initiation	P x T	0.33	36
2	T	Curiosity	Program	0.01	37
2	T	Curiosity	Time	1.01	37
2	T	Curiosity	P x T	1.34	37
2	T	Response Variability	Program	0.34	38
2	T	Response Variability	Time	2.44	38
2	T	Response Variability	P x T	0.11	38
3	K	Task Initiation	Program	0.61	39
3	K	Task Initiation	Time	0.71	39
3	K	Task Initiation	P x T	0.63	39
3	K	Curiosity	Program	0.11	40
3	K	Curiosity	Time	0.64	40
3	K	Curiosity	P x T	1.30	40
3	K	Response Variability	Program	0.78	41
3	K	Response Variability	Time	2.72	41
3	K	Response Variability	P x T	1.12	41
3	T	Task Initiation	Program	0.20	42
3	T	Task Initiation	Time	3.10*	42
3	T	Task Initiation	P x T	1.47	42
3	T	Curiosity	Program	0.55	43
3	T	Curiosity	Time	0.56	43
3	T	Curiosity	P x T	0.81	43
3	T	Response Variability	Program	0.53	44
3	T	Response Variability	Time	1.99	44
3	T	Response Variability	P x T	1.40	44

data are reported on Teacher Knowledge of DTB's, the taxonomy of classroom activities, and Teacher-PE Planning Observations.

Objective C.1

At the end of the 1973-74 school year, at least 90% of the Follow Through teachers will identify correctly all seven of the Desirable Teaching Behaviors from a videotape specifically prepared for this purpose.

As earlier noted, the Sponsor was unable to prepare a technically adequate videotape as necessary, and therefore a paper-and-pencil format was selected. The instrument was composed of 22 statements, each uniquely characteristic of one DTB. This instrument was administered to all teachers in all communities during the May site visit. The results from the eleven communities have been presented in Table 46. The community means range from 16.48 to 20.34, with a median of 19.87. While these results indicate less than perfect knowledge of the DTB's, they do indicate a relatively high degree of familiarity with the DTB's.

In order to obtain more information about the teachers' knowledge of DTB's, the results from all eleven communities were pooled, and the results were tabled by each of the eleven DTB's (there were two items for each DTB). These results have been placed in Table 47. An examination of these results suggests a need for additional training on DTB #1, 3a, 5 and 7b.

TABLE 46

Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges on DTB Identification Test Based on Responses from Teachers in 11 Communities

Community	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Low Score	High Score
K	20.03	2.25	14	22
L	17.94	3.31	10	22
M	16.48	4.08	6	22
N	20.27	2.10	16	22
O	18.38	3.65	10	22
P	19.88	2.52	13	22
Q	19.87	2.13	16	22
R	18.26	2.74	12	22
S	18.23	3.00	12	22
T	20.34	2.44	12	22
U	20.33	1.75	17	22

TABLE 47

Frequency and Percentage of Teachers Responding Correctly to None, One, or Two Instances for Each DTB (n=262)

	NONE CORRECT		ONE CORRECT		TWO CORRECT	
DTB#	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	21	8.02	92	35.12	149	59.87
2	6	2.29	23	8.78	233	88.93
3a	39	14.89	82	31.30	141	53.82
3b	14	5.34	45	17.18	203	77.481
4a	1	.382	2	.76	259	98.86
4b	1	.38	26	9.92	235	89.70
4c	2	.76	16	6.11	244	93.13
5	23	8.78	76	29.00	163	62.21
6	21	8.02	42	16.03	199	75.95
7a	3	1.15	21	8.02	238	90.84
7b	26	9.92	73	27.86	163	62.21

Objective C.2

During the 1973-74 school year, a randomly selected sample of teachers will show an average increase of at least one Desirable Teaching Behavior in planning sessions with parent educators as measured by the PECE.

(Note: Because of revised data collection procedures, no data are available to examine this objective as stated. See the discussion and results under A1(a) for more detail.)

Objective C.3

During the 1973-74 school year, 95% of a sample of teachers will use parent educators in classroom instructional activities at least 30% of the time observed as measured by the Taxonomy of Classroom Activities.

The Taxonomy of Classroom Activities (TCA) is an observational instrument which can be used in several ways. The Florida Parent Education Program used the TCA to obtain a description of the activity occuring within a classroom. The TCA was administered by Sponsor representatives in those communities which served as sites for Cincinnati Autonomy Test Battery data collection. Each time the tester returned a child to the classroom, the activities of the teacher and parent educator were noted and later recorded on a TCA form. Those communities not involved with the CATB were responsible for their own TCA data collection. The results from the TCA have been presented in Table 48. An inspection of these results is not very encouraging. According to the data, parent educators are not being used in an instructional capacity to any appreciable degree.

TABLE 48

PERCENTAGES OF TALLIES FOR VARIOUS CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES
FOR BOTH TEACHERS AND PARENT EDUCATORS
IN ELEVEN COMMUNITIES

ACTIVITY	COMMUNITY K		L		M		N		O		P		Q		R		S		T		U		TOTAL	
	T	PE	T	PE	T	PE	T	PE	T	PE	T	PE	T	PE	T	PE	T	PE	T	PE	T	PE	T	PE
1. Housekeeping	.07	.39	.23	.74	.09	.39	.00	.47	.13	.39	.11	.32			.11	.50	.01	.53	.09	.63	.00	.60	.10	.47
2. Clerical	,02	.05	.02	.02	.04	.02	.00	.15	.14	.07	.06	.07			.06	.03	.03	.02	.05	.04	.20	.00	.05	.05
3. Materials Preparation	.02	.05	.02	.01	.01	.01	.00	.05	.05	.04	.06	.15			.03	.02	.05	.08	.07	.01	.00	.08	.03	.05
4. Instruction	.82	.09	.51	.10	.78	.10	.97	.13	.58	.17	.71	.24			.55	.17	.89	.21	.69	.12	.73	.20	.70	.16
4.1. Teaching	.78	.04	.08	.06	.74	.04	.90	.09	.49	.09	.52	.14			.50	.07	.87	.09	.61	.09	.73	.20	.63	.08
4.2. Planning	.04	.05	.03	.04	.04	.06	.07	.04	.09	.08	.19	.10			.05	.10	.02	.12	.08	.03	.00	.00	.07	.07
5. Evaluation	.01	.35	.01	.09	.01	.44	.02	.17	.01	.23	.04	.19			.03	.20	.00	.10	.05	.12	.07	.00	.02	.22
6. Other	.05	.06	.21	.03	.07	.03	.02	.02	.09	.10	.02	.02			.22	.08	.02	.06	.03	.08	.00	.11	.08	.05

NO DATA

One possible explanation is that the persons doing the observation may not have been in the classroom long enough to be able to appropriately classify the parent educator's activities. However, this explanation would not necessarily hold for those projects who collected their own data. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude at this time that most parent educators in most communities are not being used in instructional capacities as much as they night be. More time must be spent with teachers encouraging them to more effectively tap the resources available in their classroom.

Objective C.4

At the beginning of the 1973-74 school year, each Follow Through teacher will submit a planning schedule indicating the times during which she will engage in planning for home visits and task building (or selection) with each parent educator. A minimum of 1 1/2 hours per week should be scheduled with each parent educator. At least 60% of the spot checks done should find teachers planning as scheduled.

The spot checks were to be carried out by local personnel, with a goal of checking each teacher at least once per month. The data were tabulated by Sponsor personnel and the results were as follows:

Community	No. Classrooms	Observations Attempted	Sucessful	Percent
K	35	13	9	(7) 69.2%
L	31	177	118	(8) 66.7%
M	23	60	10	(10) 16.7% *
N	12	80	49	(9) 61.3%
O	39	337	255	(6) 75.7%
P	19	132	130	(3) 98.5%
Q	19	(No data submitted)		
R	38	117	144	(5) 81.4%
S	26	343	300	(4) 87[illegible]
T	36	170	170	(1.5) 100.0%
U	6	20	20	(1.5) 100.0%

*Data from February to May were not included, as they were collected by teachers and thus not comparable to data from other communities.

It should be noted that nine of the eleven communities exceeded the level of proficiency as specified in the objective. One community's data were not acceptable (as noted above) and another community sent no data. Thus, it would seem that teachers and parent educators are planning together for home visits.

Additional Teacher Data

Two communities (O and U) sent data to the Sponsor using the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire to measure Teacher morale. Community O did not identify teachers by name on the post-test so the data were treated as two independent groups. The results for Community O are presented in Table 49. Community U is a small project and only four pretest post-test matches were possible. Despite the small sample size, the results for this community are very interesting (see Table 50). The results indicate that the long decline in teacher morale in this community has been reversed. The administration in this project seems to be relating better with the teachers in 1973-74 than in previous years.

Parent Educators

The parent educator is the key person in the implementation of the Florida Parent Education Program. The PE works in the classroom part time, plans with the teacher, makes home visits, and gives feedback to the teacher. Some of the data collected on parent educators was to include identification of the Desirable Teaching Behaviors, performance on the home visit, changes in the self concept, and changes in locus of control.

TABLE 49

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-Tests of Differences (Posttest-Pretest) for the 10 Scales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire

Community O

Scale Name

1. Teacher Rapport with Principal
2. Satisfaction with Teaching
3. Rapport among Teachers
4. Teacher Salary
5. Teacher Load
6. Curriculum Issues
7. Teacher Status
8. Community Support of Education
9. School Facilities and Services
10. Community Pressures

		Scale 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Pretest n=40	$\bar{x}$	63.02	69.10	45.85	12.70	36.02	15.30	22.78	12.15	16.08	16.72	309.72
	A	12.56	8.75	7.14	4.23	5.41	3.03	4.70	3.24	2.97	2.32	37.84
Posttest n=36	$\bar{x}$	59.03	67.64	42.50	15.31	36.06	15.22	23.02	12.22	15.72	16.92	303.67
	A	17.29	8.95	8.21	4.28	5.44	3.50	5.10	3.68	3.22	2.10	45.44
t		-1.16	-0.72	-1.90	2.39	0.05	-0.10	0.22	0.91	-0.50	0.38	-0.63

00120

TABLE 50

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-Tests of Differences (Posttest-Pretest) for the 10 Scales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire

Community U

Scale Name

1. Teacher Rapport with Principal
2. Satisfaction with Teaching
3. Rapport among Teachers
4. Teacher Salary
5. Teacher Load
6. Curriculum Issues
7. Teacher Status
8. Community Support of Education
9. School Facilities and Services
10. Community Pressures

		Scale 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Pretest n=4	$\bar{x}$	51.75	56.75	38.25	18.75	22.00	14.75	22.50	11.75	7.00	11.75	255.25
	A	4.57	1.71	6.18	1.50	2.58	0.96	3.32	4.57	2.31	1.50	22.20
Posttest n=4	$\bar{x}$	60.25	73.25	47.25	26.50	38.50	15.75	25.00	15.00	15.50	17.50	334.50
	A	15.39	6.24	5.44	1.73	3.70	0.96	1.63	1.41	1.29	3.11	27.84
t		0.90	4.25	1.58	5.19	6.69	1.41	1.11	1.36	6.42	2.91	3.28

90124

Objective D.1

At the end of the 1973-74 school year, at least 80% of the parent educators will correctly identify all seven of the Desirable Teaching Behaviors from a videotape specially prepared for this purpose.

As noted earlier, the procedures for assessing this objective were changed from what had been stated in the proposal. A paper-and-pencil test was constructed containing 22 items, 2 representing each of eleven behavior. This form was administered to parent educators in all eleven communities during site visits in May. These results have been presented in Table 51. Comparing the results in Table 51 with those in Table 46, it is noted that Teachers seem to be able to be capable of identifying more DTBs than are the parent educators. These results may be misleading as the identification task may be highly related to general reading ability. Previous results when parent educators and teachers have been asked to recall as many DTBs as possible have shown that PE's can recall more DTBs correctly than can teachers. In order to gain insight into the parent educators knowledge about particular DTBs, the results from all eleven communities were pooled. The number of parent educators identifying correctly none, one or two instances of each of the eleven DTBs has been presented in Table 52.

An examination of the results in Table 52 would suggest a need for additional inservice training with parent educators on DTB #1, 3a, 3b, 5, 6, and 7b.

09122

TABLE 51

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranges on DTB Identification Test based on Responses from Parent Educators in 11 Communities

Community	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Low Score	High Score
K	19.54	2.66	11	22
L	15.39	3.44	9	21
M	16.43	3.64	7	22
N	18.86	2.62	14	22
O	13.93	4.14	2	22
P	18.23	2.81	11	22
Q	16.06	4.04	7	22
R	15.98	3.85	7	22
S	16.15	3.55	6	22
T	18.29	3.16	10	22
U	19.13	1.96	16	22

00123

TABLE 52

Frequency and Percentage of Teachers Responding Correctly to None, One, or Two Instances for Each DTB (n=471)

	NONE CORRECT		ONE CORRECT		TWO CORRECT	
DTB#	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	81	17.20	200	42.46	190	40.34
2	51	10.83	91	19.32	329	69.85
3a	91	19.32	210	44.59	170	36.09
3b	90	19.11	141	29.94	240	50.96
4a	2	.425	26	5.52	443	94.06
4b	7	1.49	84	17.83	380	80.68
4c	13	2.76	72	15.29	386	81.95
5	115	24.42	167	35.46	189	40.13
6	43	9.13	122	25.90	306	64.97
7a	15	3.19	52	11.04	404	85.78
7b	104	22.08	166	35.24	201	42.68

09121

Objective D.2

During the 1973-74 school year, a randomly selected sample of parent educators will show an average increase of at least one Desirable Teaching Behavior used when presenting tasks to parents as measured by the PECE.

(Note: Because of revised data collection procedures, no data are available to examine this objective as stated. See the discussion and results under A1(a) for more detail.)

Objective D.3

During the 1973-74 school year, new parent educators will show a positive change in self-concept as measured by the subscales of the How I See Myself on a pretest-post-test basis.

The How I See Myself is a four factor self-concept instrument for adults. The instrument was administered by Sponsor representatives to new parent educators in September and again in May. Gain scores were computed on the respective subscales, and a multivariate analysis was completed to test the null hypothesis that the four mean differences were simultaneously equal to zero. The multivariate test indicated no statistically significant differences ($F=1.53$, 4 & 55df, $p>.10$). The pretest and post-test mean, standard deviations and respective gains are displayed in Table 53.

Objective D.4

During the 1973-74 school year, new parent educators will show a change toward a more internal locus of control as measured by the Social Reaction Inventory.

TABLE 53

Means, Standard Deviations, and Gains of 59 New Parent Educators on the Four Subscales of the HISM

Scales

1. Interpersonal Adequacy
2. Social Male-School
3. Physical Appearance
4. Competence

		Scale 1	2	3	4
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	56.90	38.85	20.59	19.39
	A	9.26	5.36	4.75	3.94
Posttest	$\bar{x}$	55.94	39.00	21.66	19.71
	A	11.02	6.61	4.32	3.82
Gain		-0.96	0.15	1.07	0.32

00126

Data were collected by Sponsor representatives in September and again in May. A test of significance of differences in related measures was completed and indicated no significant difference (t=-1.68, 63df). The pretest mean was 7.23 and the post-test mean was 6.53. This difference would have been significant if a one tailed test had been run. Also, the difference is in the predicted direction as a lower score indicates more internal feelings of control.

Sponsor Objective 4

During the 1973-74 school year, a randomly selected sample of parent educators will show an increase in the completeness of the home visit with mothers as evidenced by an increase in the number of topics covered as measured by the PECE.

(Note: The PECE videotapes for 1973-74 included only the teaching of a home learning activity rather than a complete home visit. Consequently, data to examine this objective are not available. See explanation under Objective A.)

Home Visit Data

The Parent Educator Weekly Report (PEWR) which is filled out by the parent educator after each home visit, yields a great amount of useful data relative to the Florida model, including: (1) parent reactions to tasks; (2) home - school relations; and (3) certain general information. During 1973-74, 124,923 home visits were made to 6,482 different qualified homes and 46,790 home visits were made to 2,762 different qualified homes. These data represent a considerable amount of home-school contact.

1. The PEWR serves as "field test" data for tasks since parents are asked to express their opinion in several ways about how they feel about the last task that was brought into the home. These data are summarized in Table 54.

The data seem to indicate two things: (1) that 1973-74 tasks were well received by the parents; and (2) that only slight differences exist between qualified and non-qualified parents with regard to the tasks. This latter finding is an important one since one goal of the Florida Model is to serve all the children in the program regardless of their socio-economic background. It seems fair to say that most parents, irregardless of background, felt that their children were interested in the tasks and were successful in doing them. Most parents felt that the tasks are important and that their level of difficulty was "just right" for their child. While a slight majority of parents spend under one hour in teaching the task to the child, almost that many spent one hour or more in such activity. It should be pointed out that

Data were collected by Sponsor representatives in September and again in May. A test of significance of differences in related measures was completed and indicated no significant difference (t=-1.68, 63df). The pretest mean was 7.23 and the post-test mean was 6.53. This difference would have been significant if a one tailed test had been run. Also, the difference is in the predicted direction as a lower score indicates more internal feelings of control.

Sponsor Objective 4

During the 1973-74 school year, a randomly selected sample of parent educators will show an increase in the completeness of the home visit with mothers as evidenced by an increase in the number of topics covered as measured by the PECE.

(Note: The PECE videotapes for 1973-74 included only the teaching of a home learning activity rather than a complete home visit. Consequently, data to examine this objective are not available. See explanation under Objective A.)

Home Visit Data

The Parent Educator Weekly Report (PEWR) which is filled out by the parent educator after each home visit, yields a great amount of useful data relative to the Florida model, including: (1) parent reactions to tasks; (2) home - school relations; and (3) certain general information. During 1973-74, 124,923 home visits were made to 6,482 different qualified homes and 46,790 home visits were made to 2,762 different qualified homes. These data represent a considerable amount of home-school contact.

1. The PEWR serves as "field test" data for tasks since parents are asked to express their opinion in several ways about how they feel about the last task that was brought into the home. These data are summarized in Table 54.

The data seem to indicate two things: (1) that 1973-74 tasks were well received by the parents; and (2) that only slight differences exist between qualified and non-qualified parents with regard to the tasks. This latter finding is an important one since one goal of the Florida Model is to serve all the children in the program regardless of their socio-economic background. It seems fair to say that most parents, irregardless of background, felt that their children were interested in the tasks and were successful in doing them. Most parents felt that the tasks are important and that their level of difficulty was "just right" for their child. While a slight majority of parents spend under one hour in teaching the task to the child, almost that many spent one hour or more in such activity. It should be pointed out that

TABLE 54

PEWR Data on Parent Reaction to Tasks

INTEREST

Type of Home	High	Mild	Disinterested	Not Asked	Not Given
Qualified	69,331 (70%)	25,662 (26%)	957 (1%)	1,712 (2%)	1,009 (1%)
Non-qualified	27,315 (74%)	8,178 (22%)	316 (1%)	617 (2%)	309 (1%)

SUCCESS

Type of Home	High	Mild	Not Successful	Not Asked	Not Given
Qualified	64,932 (66%)	29,349 (30%)	1,253 (1%)	2,005 (2%)	968 (1%)
Non-qualified	26,014 (71%)	9,248 (25%)	384 (1%)	755 (2%)	300 (1%)

IMPORTANCE

Type of Home	Important	Some Importance	No Importance	Not Asked	Not Given
Qualified	74,720 (76%)	18,742 (19%)	254 (0.3%)	3,898 (4%)	894 (1%)
Non-qualified	28,103 (77%)	6,502 (18%)	108 (0.3%)	1,688 (5%)	313 (1%)

DIFFICULTY

Type of Home	Too Difficult	Just Right	Too Easy	Not Asked	Not Given
Qualified	4,636 (5%)	85,651 (87%)	1,440 (1%)	5,338 (5%)	1,383 (1%)
Non-qualified	1,649 (4%)	31,637 (86%)	838 (2%)	2,070 (6%)	492 (1%)

TIME SPENT

Type of Home	Over 3 Hours	2-3 Hours	1-2 Hours	Under 1 Hour	Not Asked	Not Given
Qualified	5,427 (6%)	9,190 (9%)	25,454 (26%)	47,013 (48%)	8,460 (9%)	2,982 (3%)
Non-qualified	2,309 (6%)	2,868 (8%)	9,407 (26%)	18,280 (50%)	3,074 (8%)	799 (2%)

parent teaching time does not include any time that the child might have spent working on the task by himself once it was taught to him.

2. Home-School Relationships

A basic goal in the Florida Model is the strengthening of home-school relationships. Florida Model emphases include encouraging parent to visit the school, work in the classroom as a volunteer, attend parent group meetings (other than PAC), and attend PAC meetings. The Model relies heavily upon the parent educator to facilitate such parent involvement. The teacher also plays an important role by planning carefully with the parent educator in order to assist her with her activities and plans with her parents.

The 1973-74 PEWR home-school relations data are summarized in Table 55. When the data are examined and compared with those reported in previous annual reports, it is amazing how consistent the percentages are from year to year. Slight increases may be detected from 1972-73 to 1973-74 in terms of the amount of teacher-parent educator planning time and time spent informing parents of PAC meetings, but generally little change has resulted. Roughly one-fourth of the parents visited the school, slightly less than one-tenth of the parents volunteer in the classroom and attend parent group meetings (other than PAC), and slightly over one-tenth of the parents report that they attend PAC meetings.

These results are consistently obtained in spite of the fact that over half of the teacher-parent educator planning sessions for home visits are over fifteen minutes in length, that parent educators discuss the last PAC meeting with parents about half the time and

99132

TABLE 55

PEWR Data on Home-School Relations

TIME PLANNING VISIT

Type of Home	Under 15 Minutes	30 Minutes	45 Minutes	One Hour	No Planning
Qualified	55,012 (46%)	47,101 (39%)	5,225 (4%)	9,159 (8%)	3,652 (3%)
Non-qualified	20,789 (46%)	17,499 (38%)	2,381 (5%)	3,673 (8%)	1,160 (3%)

VISIT THE SCHOOL

Type of Home	Yes	No	PE Does Not Know
Qualified	28,048 (23%)	91,525 (75%)	2,660 (2%)
Non-qualified	12,040 (26%)	33,182 (72%)	843 (2%)

WORK IN CLASSROOM

Type of Home	Yes	No	PE Does Not Know
Qualified	8,473 (7%)	112,963 (92%)	962 (1%)
Non-qualified	4,101 (9%)	41,774 (90%)	262 (1%)

ATTEND PARENT GROUP

Type of Home	Yes	No	PE Does Not Know
Qualified	10,076 (8%)	105,907 (87%)	6,313 (5%)
Non-qualified	4,341 (9%)	39,956 (87%)	1,798 (4%)

ATTEND PAC MEETING

Type of Home	Yes	No	PE Does Not Know
Qualified	14,179 (12%)	99,177 (81%)	8,839 (7%)
Non-qualified	5,324 (12%)	38,541 (84%)	2,188 (5%)

DISCUSS PAC MEETING

Type of Home	Yes	No
Qualified	61,147 (50%)	60,895 (50%)
Non-qualified	22,461 (49%)	23,597 (51%)

INFORM OF PAC MEETING

Type of Home	Yes	No
Qualified	79,500 (65%)	43,030 (35%)
Non-qualified	23,828 (62%)	17,316 (38%)

PLANS FOR SCHOOL VISIT

Type of Home	Yes	No
Qualified	73,062 (60%)	49,326 (40%)
Non-qualified	24,760 (54%)	21,346 (46%)

inform them of the next PAC meeting slightly less than two-thirds of the time, and that parent educators make plans with the parents to visit the school over half the time. The problem in interpreting these somewhat consistent data is the lack of comparison data. What percentage of non-Follow Through parents typically visit the school, work in the classroom and attend parent group meetings? We suspect that these Follow Through data, especially when the parent population is considered, would look pretty good in comparison if such data were available. Especial attention is called to the very slight differences existing between qualified and non-qualified families on the data reported in Table 55 .

3. General Information

The PEWR picks up certain general information that is summarized in Table 56 . The comprehensive services data should be interpreted in light of the fact that parent educators do not generally initiate discussions of the comprehensive services but responds when the parent seeks information or makes a request. Thus, the comprehensive services data look good. The differences between the qualified and the non-qualified parents would be expected since the latter do not qualify for most of the services. It is interesting that about one-third the non-qualified parents still asked for and received some comprehensive services information. This may, in part, reflect the fact that a number of non-qualified parents are so classified because they are only slightly over the required income figure set by the Follow Through Guidelines. They are not "middle class" in terms of social class theory.

TABLE 56

PEWR Data on General Information

DISCUSS COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES?

Type of Home	Yes	No
Qualified	55,910 (46%)	66,431 (54%)
Non-qualified	15,241 (33%)	30,888 (67%)

ASK FOR TASK SUGGESTIONS?

Type of Home	Yes	No
Qualified	64,146 (53%)	58,064 (48%)
Non-qualified	22,958 (50%)	23,123 (50%)

GIVEN TASK SUGGESTIONS?

Type of Home	Yes	No
Qualified	4,335 (4%)	117,828 (96%)
Non-qualified	1,692 (4%)	44,389 (96%)

99136

The data on asking for and getting task suggestions are very much like those of 1972-73 with only slight percentage increases. While almost half the time the parent educator reports that she is asking the parent for suggestions for tasks, the parent educator is still not getting many suggestions from parents. These results are consistent in spite of a number of inservice training efforts designed to show parent educators how to "pull tasks out of parents".

Summary of PEWR Data

While some of the PEWR data are difficult to interpret due to the lack of comparison data, the 1973-74 PEWR data generally indicate considerable strength in the program. Further, since these data are very similar to those obtained in 1972-73 and previous years, the results seem to be consistent ones. It is especially encouraging to note that the differences between qualified and non-qualified homes are slight and that the program seems to be serving all parents and children in the same way irregardless of their backgrounds.

In general, the PEWR indicates tasks are well received by parents, comprehensive services are being discussed, and at least modest success can be claimed in the area of home-school relations. Parent-generated tasks continues to be an area of weaknesses.

Home Learning Activity Data

The Parent Educator weekly Report (PEWR) also yields data concerning the extent to which we are achieving our goal of individualizing instruction through tasks. This is done by dividing the number of completed home visits during which tasks were presented by the number

of different tasks that were presented during the school year. Previous analyses indicated that such data had to be analyzed at the classroom level due to the 'sharing' of tasks across classrooms and across communities. Thus, the 1973-74 data were analyzed by classroom.

Suppose, for example, that in a class of thirty pupils each task is sent into an average of 25 homes. Little individualization in terms of choosing different tasks for different pupils and mothering ones would appear to be going on. On the other hand, if each task went into an average of five homes, a considerable amount of individualization would appear to be occuring.

Analyzing such data on a classroom by classroom basis and then making judgments about a community's overall progress isn't easily done and yields only gross estimates at best. However, the task individualization data are reported in Appendix E by community and were analyzed as follows: When a classroom contained roughly thirty pupils, an average task useage of 1 - 10 homes was judged to represent "considerable individualization". An average task usage of 11-20 homes was judged to represent "some individualization" while an average task usage of over twenty homes was held to represent "little individualization". Each community was then examined in terms of where the majority of its classrooms fall.

Using the above criteria, communities K, N, O, P, S, T, and U evidenced "considerable individualization". Communities L, M, Q, and R were judged to have "some individualization". No community appeared to fall into the "little individualization"category. These findings are indeed encouraging and possibly represent a considerable emphasis placed on such activities by both the communities and the model sponsor. Some

69138

individual classrooms are still not, of course, individualizing tasks through teacher-parent educator planning and need assistance by consultants, task specialists, and others. However, overall the picture looks quite good.

09139

Summary

The 1973-74 Sponsor evaluation of the Florida Parent Education Program used data pertaining to parents, children, teachers and parent educators. These data were collected in the eleven communities participating in the Florida Model of Follow Through.

In general, the results relating to parents should be examined quite closely, as the Florida Model is one which places great emphasis on parental involvement. The analyses of the data seemed to suggest the following conclusions with respect to parents:

1. Parents who have been involved with the Florida Model use more "desirable teaching behaviors" than do non-Follow Through parents.

2. A substantial percentage of families (Community Median - 27%) attended at least one PAC meeting. Although performance did not meet the desired criterion, a large number of parents did participate at PAC meetings. To a lesser degree, parents participated in PAC related activities (Community Median - 14%).

3. Follow Through parents did volunteer in classrooms. In the 11 communities, the distribution of percentages of parents volunteering at least once had a median of 42%.

4. The regularity of home visits was lower than anticipated. However, this discrepancy may reflect problems in the delivery system rather than parental non-participation.

5. Parents have been involved in making decisions about the Follow Through program. This conclusion was reached by inspection of PAC meeting minutes.

6. Parents who have been involved in the Florida Model seem to have changed their style of parenting. Younger children from these families come to school better prepared than do children from families who have not been in Follow Through.

7. Examination of measures of the home environment suggests that low income families showed positive changes in Awareness of Child Development, Availability, and Use of Supplies for Language Development, Materials for Learning in the Home, and Reading Press.

The data on children examined as part of this evaluation consisted of standard achievement measures, attendance, and self concept measures. The following conclusions seem warranted after analysis of child data:

1. The results from standardized achievement tests give a confusing picture. Some communities show positive results, some show negative results, and some show no differences between Follow Through and non-Follow Through groups. These differences in results might be attributed to the difficulty in obtaining adequate comparison groups.

2. The attendance data also present a mixed picture. Again, the differences may be a function of the comparison groups used rather than a measure of program effect.

3. The self concept data seem to suggest positive pretest/posttest changes in kindergarten and first grade, and negative changes in second and third grade. These findings may be descriptive of what happens to children in public schools, rather than results specific to the Florida Model.

4. The analysis of the data from subtests of the Cincinnati Autonomy Test Battery provided no meaningful insights, and the battery has been dropped from the evaluation design.

The data collected on teachers provided information about the knowledge of the Desirable Teaching Behaviors, the use of paraprofessionals in the classroom, and planning for home visits. Based on the data, these conclusions are suggested:

1. The teachers are able to identify instances of the Desirable Teaching Behaviors. However, the results indicated that some of the behaviors are less familiar than others.

2. Although there are some community differences, teachers do not appear to be using parent educators effectively in classroom instruction activities. However, part of the problem lies with the manner in which data were collected, and the procedures have been revised.

3. Observation of Teacher/Parent Educator planning sessions indicated that generally, planning for home visits did occur as scheduled. This finding is supported by the Home Learning Activity individualization data.

Data collected on Parent Educators included information on knowledge of the Desirable Teaching Behaviors, and changes in the parent educators, themselves. Based on these data, the following conclusions may be reached:

1. Parent Educators are reasonably familiar with the Desirable Teaching Behaviors. In general, their performance on the identification test was lower than that by teachers, but this finding might be attributed to reading ability as the identification test was loaded with a verbal factor. Several of the DTBs were identified for further inservice work.

2. The changes in new parent educators were not apparent based on the measures used. Self concept measures indicated little

change, and the lows of control measure changed toward an internal lows, but not significantly.

The data provided by the PEWR suggest the following conclusions:

1. Parents view the Home Learning Activities positively.

2. Parents seem to be reluctant to give suggestions for tasks.

00143

APPENDIX A

Parental Attitudes Toward The Follow Through Program

by Roberta R. Streit

May, 1974

*Roberta R. Streit, Doctoral Student, University of Florida, Institute for the Development of Human Resources, College of Education.

09144

Parental Attitudes Toward the Follow Through Program

INTRODUCTION:

The Florida Parent Education Follow Through Program is an educational research program adopted in eleven communities distributed in ten states. Because of the importance of parental involvement in this program, a comprehensive parent assessment of the Follow Through model was conducted both in 1972 (McDowell report) and at the end of the 1972-73 school year (Bozler report). These two parental evaluation surveys were conducted in Alachua County which served as an experimental parent educator home model at that time. In May, 1974, a similar survey was conducted in two of the Florida model's communities. Of the two communities that were surveyed, one is a large urban city located in the southeastern sector of the United States and the other community is a small rural town comprised of 7,000 people in the midwestern part of the United States. Throughout this report, the former will be referred to as community L and the latter as Community N.

Section 1: PROCEDURES

A. Development of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire that was used in 1972 and 1973 was revised in April, 1974 by Ms. Roberta R. Streit with the assistance of the Follow Through staff. Several meetings were held to revise the original questionnaire and to make some suggestions for additional questions.

The final questionnaire was approved by Dr. Gordon Greenwood in May, 1974. A copy of this questionnaire is included in Appendix B of this report.

B. Sampling Procedures

The subjects in this study were selected by use of a table of random numbers. A sample size of 90 was chosen as well as a sample of 90 comparable alternates. These samples were drawn according to economic level and race. Included in the sample were 30 parents from community N which comprised 5% of that area's population in Follow Through, and 60 parents from community L comprising 10% of that community's Follow Through population. In community N, the majority of the population chosen was white with an even distribution from the qualified and non-qualified income level families. In community L, the majority of the families were black and from the lower socioeconomic level.

C. Field Interviews

In preparation for the field interview, six undergraduate students were chosen and briefed as to the procedure to follow when conducting the visitation in the two respective communities. Four students were chosen to go to community L and the other two were chosen to go to community N.

Prior to the visit, two letters were sent to the selected sample of parents in each community for the purpose of explaining the format and purpose of the interview. It was explicitly stated in these letters

that the interview was to be kept completely confidential and would be for the purpose of evaluating the Florida Follow Through parent education model. One of the letters was sent to the original ninety parents that were randomly selected and the other letter was sent to ninety additional parents chosen as alternates to the original sample. (See Appendix). In addition, a letter was sent to the parent-educators that are associated with the random sample of parents. This letter was sent to inform them of the interviewing procedure and to ask their assistance with the interview if the circumstances required it. (See Appendix B).

The questionnaire was administered during the week of May 5-May 12, 1974. Each interviewer was given an introductory letter and an additional comment letter which was to be left with the parent so that they would have an opportunity to communicate to the Institute any further comments they felt relevant (See Appendix B).

Section II: RESULTS

A. General Overview

As mentioned earlier, the random sample for this interview was chosen according to economic level and race. Because of the nature of this sample, several comparisons can be made. The primary considerations are presented in terms of frequency of questions answered according to the different categories listed under each individual question. These categories represent answers ranging from highly positive responses to extremely negative responses. In addition, answers have been analyzed

09147

according to the two different communities visited, race, and economic levels. Subtotals are computed for Community L and Community N, as well as an overall grand total for the two communities involved. (See Appendix C).

B. Discussion of Results

In order to facilitate analysis of the results, the discussion will be subdivided into major categories of concern as presented in the questionnaire.

Category One: General Program

A comprehensive overview of questions one through four suggests a favorable parental reaction towards the program in general. Question 1, which deals with the parent's initial reaction to Follow Through shows that 66% of the total population expressed a favorable response to the program. This result can further be delineated by the two communities: Community L had a 68% favorable reaction and Community N had a 63% favorable response. The black population in each of these communities responded more favorably to the program than the white population as indicated below:

When someone first came and explained the Follow Through Program what did you think about it?

	Community L		Community N	
	Black	White	Black	White
Favorable Reaction	82%	26%	100%	62%

In addition to this favorable response, 96% of the population thought the program was a good idea (Question 1B).

09148

Based on Question 2A, the data indicate that the majority of the parents have been in the program for one year and commented that the program was a success (84% - Question 3B). Some of the desirable aspects of the program that were mentioned related to the increased attention offered to the children as a result of the program (15% - grand total), and the cohesiveness shown as a consequence of the school and parents working together (20% - Question 2B). When asked about the undesirable aspects of the program, 41% of the total population responded that there were no undesirable aspects and an additional 41% did not respond. A small percentage (7%) said "more attention", "discipline", and "time for tasks" were needed (Question 2B).

In response to Question 3A, addressed to the goals of the program, 55% of the total population said the program was designed to help children educationally and socially. An additional 12% said that one of the programs goals was to help form a better relationship between parents and children.

A large majority of parents (78%) stated that they thought parents should have a voice in the operation of the Follow Through model (Question 4A) and stated parental involvement (18% and parental knowledge of children's needs (31%) as the reasons for this. Interestingly enough, only 12% gave reasons why parents should not participate in the operation of Follow Through. These reasons included satisfaction with Follow Through services as it is now operating (7.8%) and a feeling of inferiority or disqualification concerning the program (4.4%) concerning the program (4.4%) (Question 4B).

To further support the conclusion that parents express favorable attitudes toward Follow Through, 2 comment letters were received by the Institute for the Development of Human Resources expressing a deep gratitude for Follow Through in general and commenting on the continuance of the program.

Category Two: Parental Involvement With Their Children

A careful examination of the data in this area indicates Follow Through's considerable impact on parental involvement with their children (Question 5).

Due to the nature of question 5A, addressed to parental involvement with children before the program started, multiple answers were offered and the totals for each community were above 100% and were, therefore, eliminated from the tables. The most common areas in which the parents offered their help were the areas of math, reading, and ABC's (23%, 31%, and 26% respectively) (Question 5A). As evidenced by question 5A, 51% of the total population said they were doing different types of things with their child now as opposed to before the program started. This new involvement included an increased awareness of their children's schoolwork, tasks, and activities (43% and 12% respectively) (Question 5C). Similarly, 64% of the Follow Through parents acknowledged spending more time with their children now as opposed to before the commencement of Follow Through (Question 5D).

Category Three: School Achievement

We were particularly interested in knowing if the parents thought that their participation in the program had contributed to an improvement in their children's performance in school. Based on the data indicated

in question 6B, 62% of the population responded positively to this with the emphasis being in the qualified areas of both communities (Community L - 70% qualified, 33% non-qualified; Community N - 66% qualified, 53% non-qualified). In addition, parents indicated that Follow Through was the prime force in contributing to their children's desirable behavior in school and subsequent relations with his teacher and peers (See Table I).

Category Four: Teacher, Parent, and Parent Educator Relations

Questions 9 through 15, and question 22 deal with the different aspects of the teacher - parent - parent educator relationship.

In analyzing the responses for questions 9A and 9B, it becomes apparent that the majority of Parent Educators do not live in the same neighborhood as the parents who were interviewed (63%). Additionally, a sufficient number of parents (35%) indicated that they thought the parent educator should not live in the same neighborhood as they. More parents in Community N (46%) responded negatively to this question than in Community L (30%).

Parental response to question 10A and 10B suggests that a moderate number of the parent educators are of the same economic background as the parents interviewed.(36% overall, 53% Community N, 28% Community L). However, a sizable number of parents (36% total sample) said that it was unnecessary for the parent educator to be of the same economic background as themselves. The response to these questions were higher in the qualified category of Community L (33%) than in the non-qualified category of that same Community (25%).

TABLE I

		COMMUNITY L	COMMUNITY N	TOTAL
7A.	Has your child's behavior improved this school year?			
	YES	48%	33%	43%
	NO	10%	23%	15%
7B.	How much is this due to Follow Through?			
	A LOT	45%	26%	38%
	NONE	10%	3%	7%
8A.	Does child get along better with his teacher now as compared to before he was in Follow Through?			
	YES	46%	66%	53%
	NO	6%	3%	5%
8B.	Is this due to Follow Through?			
	YES	31%	43%	35%
	NO	2%	3%	2%
8C.	Does your child get along better with his peers now as compared to before he was in Follow Through?			
	YES	56%	60%	57%
	NO	3%	0%	2%
8D.	Is this due to Follow Through?			
	YES	36%	56%	43%
	NO	3%	3%	3%
8E.	Does your child like school more now as compared to before he was in Follow Through?			
	YES	55%	73%	61%
	NO	6%	6%	6%
8F.	Is this due to Follow Through?			
	YES	35%	60%	43%
	NO	3%	0%	2%

A large percentage of parents (71%) indicated that their teacher did not make any home visits (Question 11A). Of the teachers that did visit various homes, 14% of them visited only once. Among the reasons for visitation were for discussion of the child (14%), discussion of schoolwork (3%), discussion about Follow Through and tasks (4%), and general discussion for the purpose of "getting acquainted" (7%) (Question 11E).

Questions 12A through 12F deal with reactions to how and why the teacher should make regularly scheduled home visits. Sixty-two parents (69%) indicated that they think the teacher should not make home visits and 52% of these parents stated that the teacher had enough responsibility and should not be expected to make home visits. Twelve percent of the parents expressed a need for home and school communication with the teacher as the link between the two. Fourteen parents (15%) said the school system should provide teacher aides and pay the teacher for extra work in order to facilitate home visits.

An overwhelming response to questions 13A through 15B shows that as high as 96% of the parents expressed no difficulty at all in communicating with their teacher and parent educators, in spite of the different economic backgrounds and different living areas. This serves to demonstrate the harmony that can be easily reached among participants in Follow Through which in turn reinforces the applicability of this program.

In addition to this harmony experienced among the parents, parent educators, and teachers, 87% of the parents said they were learning more

about their children as a result of the interaction with these other people (Question 23A). Included in the new areas of learning regarding their children are those concerning behaviors at school (63%), closer communication with child (4.4%), and an increased appreciation of the child (8%) (Question 23B).

Category Five: Parent Educator and Home Visits

Based on the responses obtained in questions 16 through 19 and questions 21 and 24, many favorable comments about the home visits were received. In Sommunity L and Community N, a majority (86% and 73% respectively) of the parents indicated that the home visits should be made at the home. In Community N, however, 3 parents (10%) said the school was a good place for a visit and an additional 4 parents (6%) in Community L responded similarly (Question 16A). Reasons for the aforementioned places were convenience (58%), privacy (9%), and importance of observing the child in his home and school environment (8%). It was gratifying to note that 100% of the parents in Community N were allegedly visited by their parent educators at least once a week. Overall, 92% of the population reported this frequency of visitation of at least once a week (Question 17A). Answers to question 17B reveal that 89% of the total population thought this frequency of visitation was "just right". Similarly, 95% of the total sample felt comfortable having someone from the school visit their home on a regular basis.

It was slso indicated that seventy-seven of the respondents (85%) felt that their children liked having the parent educator and/or the teacher make home visits (Question 19). When asked about the topics that

were discussed during these home visits the parents and the parent educator mentioned topics such as tasks, comprehensive services (31%), child's performance in school (23%), PAC meetings (2%), child rearing (6%), and issues concerning family and community (15%) (Question 21).

Again, it might be mentioned that all the aforementioned data serves to solidify the idea of ease of communication experienced by the parents, parent educator, and teachers involved in the Follow Through Program.

Category Six: Tasks

An analysis of question 20 which dealt specifically with tasks (home learning activities) indicates that 81% of the total sample thought the tasks suited their child. Almost 63% of the parents said their parent educator makes an attempt to suit the tasks to their children (Question 20B).

In question 20C, an attempt was made to discern whether the parent educators used role-playing as a technique for presenting the tasks. Here, 57% of the total respondents answered positively and 41% negatively. When the parents were asked how they felt about role-playing a task, (Question 20C-How) 39% said it was good and 18% responded negatively, saying it was unnecessary or created an unsteady atmosphere. In addition, 85% of Community L and 80% of Community N said the tasks were of definite value to their children (Question 20D). An almost unanimous number of parents (87 total parents) indicated in question 20E that their children enjoyed the tasks. In addition to the apparent enjoyment experienced by these children with their tasks, the data in question 20F shows the tasks as having an influence upon other children in the same family.

Twenty-two families in Community N (73%) and twenty-five families (38%) responded favorably when asked about the influence of the tasks upon other children, whereas three families (10%) in Community N and twenty-five families (41%) in Community L responded negatively to this proposed influence (Question 20F). A sufficient number of parents (41) re-emphasized this phenomenon of vertical diffusion by stating that the other children have helped and have been helped with the tasks brought into their home.

Category Seven: Parent and Parent Educator Participation in the Classroom

Questions 25 through 27 deal with parent educator home visits and parental participation in the classroom. An almost unanimous number of Follow Through parents (88 parents - 97.8% - Question 25A) were in agreement as to the reasons for having home visitors work in the classroom. As mentioned in the questionnaire, these reasons were: "to give the child more attention" and "to give the parent educator information about the child when talking to the parents."

When asked if they ever visited the classroom, 75% of the total sample answered that they spent some time in the classroom (Question 26A). In Community N, 73% of the non-qualified parents spent time in the classroom as opposed to 60% of the qualified parents. In addition, 83% of Community L's non-qualified parents visited the classroom as opposed to 70% of the qualified parents in that community. A sufficient number of these parents (29 parents - 32 % overall total) stated that they visited the classroom for the purposes of observation only. Other

09156

parents visited the classroom in order to help the teacher (12%), work with the children (20%), and to hold a conference with the teacher (10%) (Question 26B).

When asked if they felt accepted by both the teacher and the parent educator in the classroom, 75% of the parents answered positively to acceptance by the teacher and 74% answered positively to acceptance by the parent educator. There were no negative responses in either community to this question.

Question 26E addressed itself to the reasons for non-participation in the classroom by the parent. Twelve parents (13%) stated that they were working and didn't have time. Other reasons stated were transportation problems (2%), health reasons (1%), and responsibilities to younger children at home (4%).

Question 27 asked the parents if they thought the school has developed better understanding of their child as a learner as a result of these parent educator's visits, teacher visits, and parental participation in the classroom. An overwhelming 97% responded positively to this question.

Category Eight: Interaction of Parent and School

Of particular interest was finding out parental attitudes toward the proposed interaction of home and school. A striking 98.9% of the total sample of parents stated that they thought the home and school should work together in the education of their children (Question 28A). Some of the reasons stated in defense of this were the importance of parental understanding of what happens in the school environment (22%), unity needed between the school and home because either one of these two

institutions should not take on the responsibility of the child's needs alone (6%), and the importance of parental involvement because of the parent's knowledge of their particular child's needs and wants (4%) (Question 28B).

In addition, eighty two parents stated that the program has helped them better understand what the school expects of their child in the academic areas. They stated that the program informed them of new innovations in teaching (4%), helped them realize the importance of their involvement with the children's homework (6%), and helped them treat their child as an individual at home (2%) (Question 29B).

In addition to these responses, seventy-nine parents stated that they considered themselves as a partner with the school in terms of their children's learning.

It was encouraging to find a large response to parental suggestions regarding other ways in which parents should be included in the school aside from classroom visitation. These suggestions included field trip participation (3%), volunteer work (7%), parental participation in planning of the school system (1%), parental involvement in the preparation of the school menu (1%), volunteer hours in the library (1%), and the establishment of new classes for parents (1%) (Question 31B).

Category Nine: Parental Participation in Follow Through Parent Meetings

Based on questions 32A through 32I, one will observe a moderate amount of parental participation in PAC meetings and PAC related activities. A total of 85 parents (94%) said they had been notified in advance about these Follow Through PAC meetings (Question 32A). Of the parents that were notified

about these meetings, 61% actually attended the meetings with Comminity L having a larger percentage of parental attendance (66%) than Community N (50%) (Question 32B). Based on the responses in Question 32D, addressed to the parental feelings about the value of these meetings, 49% of the parents that attended these meetings felt that they were of some value to them. Only 10% of the total sample responded negatively to this same question. When asked to describe ways in which the parent educator encouraged parental attendance, the responses were as follows: (See Table II) (Question 32E).

Table II

In what ways did your P.E. encourage you to attend these meetings?

1) P.E. specifically invited parent to come to the meeting. 14%

2) P.E. encouraged parental attendance by informing through letters. 9%

3) P.E. offers transportation assistance. 2%

Sixty-four percent of the parents surveyed said that they definitely had a voice in the operation of the Follow Through program (Question 32F). When asked to describe the manner in which they had an input into the activities of Follow Through, 11% said they had an influence by voting for issues and officers, and an additional 9% said they had planned and created Follow Through budgetary programs. Similarly, 3% of the parents stated that they made several suggestions to the Follow Through Program and these suggestions were definitely acted upon (Question 32G).

We were interested to find out if the Follow Through parents attended any parent meetings other than PAC related ones. One half of the total sample of parents stated that they did attend meetings other than PAC, and these meetings included PTA (41%), Bazaar planning (1%), comprehensive services (2%), and various open houses (1%) (Questions 32H and 32I).

Category Ten: General Comments

In analyzing the responses to questions 33A and 33B, one will observe the overwhelming number of positive responses received in regard to the program in general. Some of the positive comments received from the parents are as follows:

Positive Comments Regarding Follow Through

1. Program is outstanding in general.....17%
2. Program is good for parents and children 3%
3. Children benefit from the program and the parents work hard to help their children.....11%
4. The program offers a great deal of help concerning information about comprehensive services offered in the community..... 3%

Although we received a large number of favorable responses in regard to the program in general, we did receive a small number of negative responses. Among these responses were:

Negative Comments Regarding Follow Through

1. Tasks too easy..... 1%
2. Not enough information about Follow Through disseminated to parents..... 2%

3. Parents want Follow Through in all Classrooms..... 2%

In addition to these comments about Follow Through, parents made many suggestions concerning the improvement of the program. These suggestions were as follows:

A. Suggestions regarding PAC meetings:

1. Parents should be notified in advance about PAC meetings. This way they will be better prepared for them.

2. There are too many PAC parties and projects. This is getting away from the purpose of the program. We do not spend enough time discussing issues regarding the children of the program.

B. Suggestions regarding Tasks and Parent Educators:

1. Tasks should be more related to the child's schoolwork.

2. P.E. isn't helpful because she doesn't spend enough time on the tasks and schoolwork.

C. Suggestions regarding the school:

1. A "parent" day should be established. This day would be for the purpose of having the parent spend a full day with the child at the school.

2. Parents should help prepare the school menu.

3. Parents should play a part in the planning of the entire school system.

4. Special classes for parents are more widely needed (i.e., reading, math).

5. Parents who cannot attend the PTA meetings should not be deprived of going on school trips. The teacher usually picks those parents who frequently attend these meetings.

D. Suggestions regarding the Program:

1. Middle income children should not be deprived of the summer program trips.

99161

Section III: Conclusions

1. There was an overall favorable response towards the Follow Through program in general (see Categories One and Ten).
2. A majority of the Follow Through parents spend more time with their children now as opposed to before the commencement of Follow Through (see Category Two). Similarly, the majority of the parents stated that their participation in the program had contributed to an improvement in their children's performance in school (see Category Three).
3. In spite of different economic backgrounds and neighborhoods, the data presented in this report serves to solidigy the idea of ease of communication experienced by the parent, parent educator, teachers, and other participants involved in the Follow Through program (see Categories Four and Five).
4. A majority of parents from both communities were pleased with the home learning activities, stating that they were suited to their children (see Category Six).
5. An overwhelming number of parents (89 parents - 98.9%) stated that they thought the home and school should work together in the education of their children. This serves to reinforce the applicability of the Follow Through program (see Categories Seven and Eight).
6. Although most parents were notified in advance about PAC meetings (94%), only 61% actually attended these meetings. Suggestions regarding improvements in this area are presented in Table VI (see Category Nine).

99162

APPENDIX B

Forms and Letters
in Conjunction with the Parent Interview

A. When someone first came and explained the Follow Through Program, what did you think about it?

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Was it a good idea?

Good — Undecided — Bad

5 4 3 2 1

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. A. How many years have you been in the program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. What do you think about the program now that you have been in it for (insert no. of yrs. in program from 2A)? What are the good things? What things are not so good?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. A. What do you think this program was trying to do?

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Did it accomplish what it was trying to do?

Yes it accomplished most of what it was trying to do — Undecided — No it didn't accomplish anything it was trying t.

5 4 3 2 1

Success — Failure

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. A. Do you think parents should have a voice in the running of the Follow Through program?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

B. Why or Why Not?
(Whichever is appropriate)

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. A. What kinds of things did you do with your child that were helpful to him in school before this program started?

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Are you doing different kinds of things with your child now as opposed to before this program started?

Yes - many different things — Undecided — No - no different

5 4 3 2 1

C. If the answer to (B) is yes, please explain:

_____

_____

_____

_____

D. Do you spend more time with your child now?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 3 4 2 1

6. A. Has your child's achievement (grades on tests, etc.) in school improved this year? (Kindergarten parents cannot answer this question)

Yes a lot — Undecided — No - Not at all

5 4 3 2 1

B. How much do you think this is due to our program? Please explain:

A lot — Undecided — None

5 4 3 2 1

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. A. Has your child's behavior improved this school year?

Yes a lot — Undecided — No not at all

5 4 3 2 1

B. How much do you think this is due to our program? Please explain:

A lot — Undecided — None

5 4 3 2 1

_____

_____

_____

8. A. Does your child get along better with his teacher now as compared to before he or she (whichever is appropriate) was in Follow Through?

Yes — Undecided — No not at all

5 4 3 2 1

_____

_____

_____

B. If the answer to A is yes, is this due to Follow Through? Please explain.

Yes — Undecided — No not at all

5 4 3 2 1

_____

_____

_____

C. Does your child get along better with the other children now as compared to before he or she (whichever is appropriate) was in Follow Through?

Yes — Undecided — No not at all

5 4 3 2 1

D. If the Answer to C is yes, is this due to Follow Through? Please explain:

Yes — Undecided — No not at all

5 4 3 2 1

_____

_____

_____

E. Does your child like school more now as compared to before he or she (whichever is appropriate) was in Follow Through ?

Yes — Undecided — No not at all

5 4 3 2 1

F. If the answer to E is yes, is this due to Follow Through? Please explain!

Yes — Undecided — No not at all

5 4 3 2 1

9. A. Does your Parent Educator live in your neighborhood or living area?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

B. Do you feel that she should live in your neighborhood or living area?

Yes definitely should — Undecided — No definitely should not

5 4 3 2 1

10. A. Is your Parent Educator of the same or similar economic background as you?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

B. Do you feel that she should be of the same or similar economic background as you?

Yes definitely should — Undecided — No definitely should not

5 4 3 2 1

11. A. Did your child's (or "children's" - whichever is appropriate) teacher visit with you in your home as well as your PE?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

If the answer to A is No, proceed to Question 12.

B. If the answer to A is yes, how often did she come to visit you in your home?

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. If the answer to A is yes, did she come with the P.E. or by herself.

P. E.

Herself

Other: _____

D. If the answer to C is other, please explain:

_____

_____

_____

_____

E. If the answer to A is yes, what did your teacher come to do?

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. A. If the teacher were alone in the classroom, do you think the teacher should make regularly scheduled home visits doing things like your P.E. has done?

Yes definitely		Undecided		No definitely Not
5	4	3	2	1

B. Please explain why:

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. If there are no teacher aides, do you think there is a way the teacher could visit you?

Yes		Undecided		No
5	4	3	2	1

D. If the answer to C is yes, how?

_____

_____

_____

_____

E. If the answer to C is yes, how often should these visits be made?

_____

_____

_____

_____

F. How do you think the school system should handle this?

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. A. Have you ever communicated with (child's name) teacher?

Yes		Undecided		No
5	4	3	2	1

B. If the answer to A is yes, did you have problems communicating with (child's name) teacher?

Yes		Undecided		No
5	4	3	2	1

C. If the answer to B is yes, please explain:

_____

_____

_____

_____

14. A. Do you have problems communicating with the P. E.

Yes		Undecided		No
5	4	3	2	1

B. If yes, please explain:

_____

_____

_____

_____

. A. Does the teacher and/or the P. E. have problems communicating with you?

Yes		Undecided		No
5	4	3	2	1

B. If yes, please explain:

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. A. Should the visits by the teacher and/or the P. E. be made at your home, at the school, or elsewhere?

Home

School

Elsewhere: _____

B. Why?

_____

_____

_____

_____

17. A. How often were you visited in your home by your P.E.?
Specific answer_____

Once a week or more	Once every 2 weeks	Once every 3 weeks	Once a month	Less than once a month
5	4	3	2	1

B. Was this too much, too little, or just right.

Too Little	Just Right	Too Much
5	3	1

18. A. Do you feel comfortable having someone from the school come to your home on a regular basis?

Yes-very comfortable		Undecided		No-very Uncomfortable
5	4	3	2	1

B. If the answer to A is no, what made you uncomfortable?

_____

_____

_____

_____

19. Does your child like having the P.E. and/or the teacher come home and visit with you?

Yes		Undecided		No
5	4	3	2	1

20. A. Are the tasks suited to your child? (i.e. too easy, too difficult)

Too easy		Just Right		Too difficult
5	4	3	2	1

B. Does the P. E. attempt to make the tasks fit your child?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

C. Did the P.E. ever ask you to role-play back a task?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

How did you feel about this?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Why:

_____

_____

_____

_____

D. Are the tasks of value to your child?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

If no, how should the tasks be changed in order to make them of more value to your child?

_____

_____

_____

_____

E. Does your child like the tasks?

Yes very Much — Undecided — No - Not at all

5 4 3 2 1

F. If you have any other children, have the other children in your family been affected by the tasks in any way?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

Please explain how:

_____

_____

_____

_____

How old are these children?

_____

_____

_____

_____

21. A part from the tasks, what do you and the P.E. talk about that you consider valuable?

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. A. Did you make suggestions to your P. E.?

Undecided Yes very often Some-times Hardly ever No - Not at all

5 4 3 2 1

If your answer to A is yes, then answer B & C.

B What kind of suggestions did you make?

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Do you know if your suggestions were followed up?

Yes Undecided No

5 4 3 2 1

23. A. Are you learning more about your child from the P.E. and the teacher?

Yes Uncertain No

5 4 3 2 1

B. If the answer to A is yes, what are you learning?

_____

_____

_____

_____

24. Have the home visits affected the way in which you teach things to your child? Please explain:

Yes Undecided No

5 4 3 2 1

_____

_____

_____

_____

25. The reasons for having home visitors work in the classroom are:

1. To give each child more attention

2. To give the Parent Educator information about the child when talking to the parents.

A. Are these good reasons to you?

Yes — Undecided — No
5 4 3 2 1

B. Should the Parent Educator work part-time in the classroom with the teacher?

Yes — Undecided — No
5 4 3 2 1

C. If the parent says no to either A or B ask them what they would change to make the program more meaningful to them.

_____

_____

_____

_____

26. A. Did you ever go to the classroom?

Undecided — Yes, Often — Yes, Sometimes — No, Never
4 3 2 1

Specific Answer: _____

If the answer to (A) is Yes: Answer B through D, G and H.

If the answer to A is no, answer E through H.

B. What did you do when you went to the class?

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Did you feel accepted by the teacher in the classroom?

Yes-very much accepted — Undecided — No-Not at all
5 4 3 2 1

_____

_____

_____

00177

D. Did you feel accepted by the P.E. in the classroom?

Yes- very much accepted — Undecided — No-Not Accepted

5 4 3 2 1

If the answer to A is no, Answer E,F, G, H.

E. Why didn't you visit the classroom?

1. Working-didn't have time.
2. Not invited
3. Young children at home
4. Transportation problem
5. Other:

F. Did you contribute anything to the class even though you didn't visit the classroom?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

If the answer to A is yes, Answer G & H.

G. Did you ever work with the children in the program?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

H. If the answer to G is yes, how often? Specific answer: _____

Undecided — Often — Some-times — Never

4 3 2 1

27. As a result of the teacher and parent educator visiting with you and you with them, does the school have a better understanding of your child as a learner?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

28. A. Should the school and the home work together in the education of your child and other children?

Yes — Uncertain — No

5 4 3 2 1

B. Can you tell me why you feel that way? Please explain.

_____

_____

_____

_____

29. A. Has the program helped you as a parent better understand what the school expects of your child in the academic areas (reading, Mathematics, etc.)?

Yes — Uncertain — No

5 4 3 2 1

B. If yes, please explain. If no, why not?

_____

_____

_____

_____

30. A. Do you consider yourself as a partner with the school in terms of your child's learning?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

B. Please elaborate.

_____

_____

_____

_____

31. A. Do you think there are other ways that parents should be included in school aside from PTA, working in classrooms, and serving as class mothers?

Yes		Undecided		No
5	4	3	2	1

B. What other ways do you think parents should be included in schools?

_____

_____

_____

_____

32. A. Were you notified in advance about Follow Through PAC meetings?

Yes		Undecided		No
5	4	3	2	1

B. Did you attend these Pac meetings?

Undecided	Yes Often	Yes Sometimes	No-Not At All
4	3	2	1

C. If the answer to B is yes, how many meetings did you attend?

_____

_____

_____

_____

D. If the answer to B is yes, were the meetings of value to you?

Yes-of tremendous value		Undecided		No-No value at all
5	4	3	2	1

E. In what ways did your PE encourage you to attend these meetings?

_____

_____

_____

_____

F. Did the parents have a voice in how the program operates at these PAC meetings?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

G. If the answer to F is yes, in what ways did the parents have a voice in how the program operates?

_____

_____

_____

_____

H. Did you attend any parent meetings other than PAC meetings?

Yes — Undecided — No

5 4 3 2 1

I. If the answer to H is yes, what other parent meetings did you attend?

_____

_____

_____

_____

33. If there is anything else on which you wish to comment, please state.

_____

_____

_____

_____

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT
OF HUMAN RESOURCES

[illegible]20 Weil Hall

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
university of florida
gainesville, florida - 32611

PROJECT FOLLOW THROUGH

April 16, 1974

FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION
Gordon E. Greenwood, Co-Director
William B. Ware, Co-Director
Hattie Bessent
Ira J. Gordon
Barry J. Guinagh
R. Emile Jester
John M. Newell
Art Newman
Rod Webb

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
William F. Breivogel, Co-Director
Don Bernard
Thomas Fillmer
Mae (Stevie) Hoffman
Simon Johnson
Afriol B. Packer
Joe Shea

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT
OF HUMAN RESOURCES
Alan Collier
Patricia P. Olmsted

Dear

The Institute for Development of Human Resources at the University of Florida is attempting to evaluate the Follow Through Program in your community. Since your child is involved in this program, we are interested in getting your feeling about the program.

You have been randomly selected as one of 60 parents from a total group of 759 parents to be interviewed. One of our interviewers will be coming to your home during the week of May 5 to May 12. This interview will be scheduled in place of your regularly scheduled home visit and will take no longer than 30 minutes and, of course, will be confidential.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation in this matter and we look forward to talking with you at that time.

Sincerely,

William F. Breivogel

William F. Breivogel
Co-Director
University of Florida Follow
Through Program

WFB/vp

[illegible]0182

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT
OF HUMAN RESOURCES

520 Weil Hall

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
university of florida
gainesville, florida - 3261

PROJECT FOLLOW THROUGH

FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION
Gordon E. Greenwood, Co-Director
William B. Ware, Co-Director
Hattie Bessent
Ira J. Gordon
Barry J. Guinagh
R. Emile Jester
John M. Newell
Art Newman
Rod Webb

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
William F. Breivogel, Co-Director
Don Bernard
Thomas Fillmer
Mae (Stevie) Hoffman
Simon Johnson
Athol B. Packer
Joe Shea

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES
Alan Coller
Patricia P. Olmsted

April 16, 1974

Dear

The Institute for Development of Human Resources at the University of Florida is attempting to evaluate the Follow Through Program in your community. Since your child is involved in this program, we are interested in getting your feeling about the program.

You have been randomly selected as one of 30 parents from a total group of 243 parents to be interviewed. One of our interviewers will be coming to your home during the week of May 5 to May 12. This interview will be scheduled in place of your regularly scheduled home visit and will take no longer than 30 minutes and, of course, will be confidential.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation in this matter and we look forward to talking with you at that time.

Sincerely,

Gordon Greenwood

Gordon Greenwood, Senior Co-Director
University of Florida Follow Through Program

GG/vp

00183

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT
OF HUMAN RESOURCES

520 Weil Hall

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
university of florida
gainesville, florida - 32611

PROJECT FOLLOW THROUGH

FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION
Gordon E. Greenwood, Co-Director
William B. Ware, Co-Director
Hattie Bessent
Ira J. Gordon
Barry J. Guinagh
R. Emile Jester
John M. Newell
Art Newman
Rod Webb

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
William F. Breivogel, Co-Director
Don Bernard
Thomas Fillmer
Mae (Stevie) Hoffman
Simon Johnson
Athol B. Packer
Joe Shea

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES
Alan Coller
Patricia P. Olmsted

April 16, 1974

Dear

The Institute for Development of Human Resources at the University of Florida is attempting to evaluate the Follow Through Program in your community. We have randomly selected some parents in your community to be interviewed regarding their evaluation of the program. Your name has been chosen as one of the families to be interviewed if we find it necessary to expand our list. The interview will take place during the week of May 5 to May 12. It will take no longer than 30 minutes and will be scheduled in place of your regularly scheduled home visit, and, of course, it will be confidential.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation in this matter and we look forward to talking to you at that time.

Sincerely,

Gordon E. Greenwood

Gordon E. Greenwood, Senior Co-Director
University of Florida Follow Through
Program

GEG/vp

09181

In cooperation with Richmond, Virginia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Jonesboro, Arkansas, Yakima, Washington, Jacksonville, Florida, Lac du Flambeau, Wisconsin, Tampa, Florida, Winnsboro, South Carolina, Chattanooga, Tennessee, Lawrenceburg, Indiana, Houston, Texas, and the Florida Educational Research and Development Council.

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT
OF HUMAN RESOURCES

520 Weil Hall

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
university of florida
gainesville, florida - 32611

PROJECT FOLLOW THROUGH

FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION
Gordon E. Greenwood, Co-Director
William B. Ware, Co-Director
Hattie Bessent
Ira J. Gordon
Barry J. Guinagh
R. Emile Jester
John M. Newell
Art Newman
Rod Webb

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
William F. Breivogel, Co-Director
Don Bernard
Thomas Fillmer
Mae (Stevie) Hoffman
Simon Johnson
Athol B. Packer
Joe Shea

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES
Alan Coller
Patricia P. Olmsted

April 17, 1974

Dear

The Institute for Development of Human Resources at the University of Florida is evaluating the Follow Through Program in your community. We are sending four girls to your community to interview a random sample of parents during the week of May 5 - May 12. We would appreciate it if you would travel with these girls to the parent's homes during your regularly scheduled home visit and allow each girl to administer a questionnaire at that time.

Enclosed is a list of your parents that have been selected to be interviewed. The interviewer will be either _____ or _____ and she will be contacting you during the week of May 5 - May 12 to make further arrangements.

We appreciate your help and cooperation in this matter. We look forward to seeing you in May.

Sincerely,

Roberta R. Streit

Roberta R. Streit
Assistant to William Breivogel,
Co-Director
University of Florida Follow
Through Program

RRS/vp

00185

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT
OF HUMAN RESOURCES

520 Weil Hall

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
university of florida
gainesville, florida - 32611

PROJECT FOLLOW THROUGH

FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION
Gordon E. Greenwood, Co-Director
William B. Ware, Co-Director
Hattie Bessent
Ira J. Gordon
Barry J. Guinagh
R. Emile Jester
John M. Newell
Art Newman
Rod Webb

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
William F. Breivogel, Co-Director
Don Bernard
Thomas Fillmer
Mae (Stevie) Hoffman
Simon Johnson
Athel B. Packer
Joe Shea

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES
Alan Coller
Patricia P. Olmsted

April 17, 1974

Dear

The Institute for Development of Human Resources at the University of Florida is evaluating the Follow Through Program in your community. We are sending two girls to your community to interview a random sample of parents during the week of May 5 - May 12. We would appreciate it if you would travel with these girls to the parent's homes during your regularly scheduled home visit and allow each girl to administer a questionnaire at that time.

Enclosed is a list of your parents that have been selected to be interviewed. The interviewer will be either _____ or _____ and she will be contacting you during the week of May 5 - May 12 to make further arrangements.

We appreciate your help and cooperation in this matter. We look forward to seeing you in May.

Sincerely,

Roberta R. Streit

Roberta R. Streit
Assistant to Gordon E. Greenwood,
Senior Co-Director
University of Florida Follow
Through Program

RRS/vp

00186

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT
OF HUMAN RESOURCES

520 Weil Hall

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
university of florida
gainesville, florida - 32611

PROJECT FOLLOW THROUGH

FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION
Gordon E. Greenwood, Co-Director
William B. Ware, Co-Director
Hattie Bessent
Ira J. Gordon
Barry J. Guinagh
R. Emile Jester
John M. Newell
Art Newman
Rod Webb

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
William F. Breivogel, Co-Director
Don Bernard
Thomas Fillmer
Mae (Stevie) Hoffman
Simon Johnson
Athol B. Packer
Joe Shea

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES
Alan Coller
Patricia P. Olmsted

May 12, 1974

Dear Follow Through Parent:

As you know from an earlier contact, the Institute for Development of Human Resources at the University of Florida is evaluating the Follow Through Program in your community. My name is _____ _____ and I have been chosen to interview you and provide you with a chance to evaluate this program. The questionnaire I will be using will be kept completely confidential and your name will not be used with the data collected.

The Institute for Development of Human Resources has also provided an additional form for you to fill out if you have any further comments to make about the Follow Through Program after this interview takes place. An envelope addressed to the Institute for Development of Human Resources in Gainesville, Florida, is also enclosed for your convenience. The Institute hopes you will feel free to comment on this sheet.

The Institute for Development of Human Resources appreciates your full cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Representative for
Gordon E. Greenwood, Senior
Co-Director
University of Florida Follow
Through Program

GEG/vp
Enclosure

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT
OF HUMAN RESOURCES

520 Weil Hall

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
university of florida
gainesville, florida - 32611

PROJECT FOLLOW THROUGH

FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION

Gordon E. Greenwood, Co-Director
William B. Ware, Co-Director
Hattie Bessent
Ira J. Gordon
Barry J. Guinagh
R. Emile Jester
John M. Newell
Art Newman
Rod Webb

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

William F. Breivogel, Co-Director
Don Bernard
Thomas Fillmer
Mae (Stevie) Hoffman
Simon Johnson
Athol B. Packer
Joe Shea

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT
OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Alan Coller
Patricia P. Olmsted

Dear Follow Through Parent:

Please feel free to make any additional comments you might have regarding the Follow Through Program on this form. An envelope addressed to the Institute for the Development of Human Resources is enclosed for your convenience in mailing this to Gainesville, Florida.

Thank you once again for your cooperation.

Other comments I wish to make: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

In cooperation with Richmond, Virginia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Jonesboro, Arkansas, Yakima, Washington, Jacksonville, Florida, Lac du Flambeau, Wisconsin, Tampa, Florida, Winnsboro, South Carolina, Chattanooga, Tennessee, Lawrenceburg, Indiana, Houston, Texas, and the Florida Educational Research and Development Council.

09188

APPENDIX C

Tabulated Results from Parent Interviews

00189

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L								COMMUNITY N								GRAND TOTAL	
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB TOTAL			
	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%	FREQ	%
1A.																						
1. Thought it was great, favorable reaction	34	70.8	7	58.3	37	82.2	4	26.7	41	68.3	1	75.3	8	53.3	1	100.0	19	62.1	19	63.3	60	66.7
2. Interesting	1	4.2			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
3. Eager to be a part of it			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7			4	25.7			4	13.5	4	13.3	5	5.6
4. It was going to grow	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
5. At first, for slow learners, or underprivileged children	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7	2	13.3	1	6.7			3	10.3	3	10.0	4	4.4
6. Not informed about it	4	8.3	2	16.7	2	4.4	4	26.7	6	10.0	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	8	8.9
7. Didn't understand	4	8.3	1	8.3	2	4.4	3	20.0	5	8.3			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	2	6.7
8. Thought it was awful, unfavorable reaction			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
9. Non-Applicable	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
10. Blank	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	12	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
1B.																						
1. Bad			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7											1	1.1
2.																						
3. Undecided			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
4.																						
5. Good	48	100.0	10	83.3	45	100.0	13	86.7	58	96.7	14	93.3	15	100.0	1	100.0	28	96.6	29	96.7	87	96.7
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
2A.																						
1. 1 year	13	27.1	5	41.7	13	28.9	5	33.3	18	30.0	4	26.7	5	33.3			9	31.0	9	30.0	27	30.0
2. 1 1/2 years	10	20.8	2	16.7	10	22.2	2	13.3	12	20.0											12	13.3
3. 2 years	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
4. 3 years																						
5. 4 years	6	12.5	1	8.3	5	11.1	2	13.3	7	11.7											7	7.8
6. 5 years	1	2.1					1	6.7	1	1.7											1	1.1
7. 6 years	1	2.1																				
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
2B. GOOD THINGS																						
1. Helped Scholastically	6	12.5	1	8.3	6	13.3	1	6.7	7	11.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	9	6.9
2. Child gets more attention	4	8.3	1	8.3	5	11.1			5	8.3	3	20.0	6	40.0			9	31.0	9	30.0	14	15.5
3. Opportunities for kids	1	2.1					1	6.7	1	1.7											1	1.1
4. Tasks good for kids	1	2.1					1	6.7	1	1.7			2	13.3			2	6.9	2	6.7	3	3.3
5. Helps child in general	10	20.8	3	25.0	9	20.0	4	26.7	13	21.7	1	6.7	2	13.3			3	10.3	3	10.0	16	17.8
6. Helps child and parents	5	10.4			4	8.9	1	6.7	5	8.3			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	6	6.7
7. Teachers are wonderful																						
8. P.E. is helpful			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7	2	13.3	2	13.3			4	13.8	4	13.3	5	5.6
9. Follow Through Service	4	8.3			4	8.9			4	6.7	5	33.3			1	100.0	4	13.8	5	16.7	9	10.0
10. Better relationship with home and school	2	4.3	2	16.7	4	8.9			4	6.7	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	6	6.7
11. People working together	1	2.1					1	6.7	1	1.7											1	1.1
12. Everything is good People working together	11	22.9	4	33.3	10	22.2	5	33.3	15	25.0	2	13.3	1	6.7			3	10.4	3	10.0	18	20.0
13. Non-Applicable	1	2.1																				
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
2B. NOT SO GOOD THINGS																						
1. Too much help											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
2. Not enough time for tasks											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
3. Child needs more attention (help with school)			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
4. Didn't help the mother	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3											2	2.2
5. Teacher held child back	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
6. Expectations too high																						
7. Could be more discipline																						
8. Nothing Bad	24	50.0	7	58.3	27	60.0	4	26.7	31	51.7	9	60.0	1	6.7			4	13.8	4	13.3	5	5.6
9. Non-Applicable	1	2.1					1	6.7	1	1.7												
10. Blank	2	4.2	3	25.0	11	24.4	1	6.7	12	20.0	1	6.7	13	86.7	1	100.0	19	65.5	18	60.0	37	41.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

NOTE: Due to rounding of figures in each category, totals in these tables may not add up to 100%.

09139

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY I										COMMUNITY II										GRAND TOTAL	
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL			
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%
3A.																						
1. Help children educationally, socially & in general, help reach full potential	31	64.6	5	41.7	30	66.7	6	40.0	36	60.0	11	73.3	3	20.0			14	48.3	14	46.7	50	55.6
2. Give children extra attention	4	8.3			3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7	1	6.7	2	13.3	1	100.0	2	6.9	3	10.0	7	7.8
3. Help form better relationship between parents & children	6	12.5	2	16.7	6	13.3	2	13.3	8	13.3	1	6.7	2	13.3			3	10.3	3	10.0	11	12.2
4. Help poor, underprivileged kids	2	4.2	1	8.3	1	2.2	2	13.3	3	5.0	1	6.7	4	26.7			5	17.2	5	16.7	8	8.9
5. Help form better relationship between home & school, teachers & community	2	4.2	1	8.3	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0	1	6.7	3	20.0			4	13.8	4	13.3	7	7.8
6. Help by advising on services in community (ex: food, medical)																						
7. Help by advise on services in the community & give children extra attention											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
8. Don't know	2	4.2	3	25.0	2	4.4	3	20.0	5	8.3											5	5.6
9. Non-Applicable	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
3B.																						
1. No, it was a failure											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
2.																						
3. Undecided			3	25.0	1	2.2	2	13.3	3	5.0											3	3.3
4.																						
5. Yes, it was a success	8	16.7			1	2.2	3	20.0	4	6.7											5	5.6
6. Yes, helped other kids	39	81.3	8	66.7	35	77.8	9	60.0	47	78.3	14	93.3	15	100.0	1	100.0	28	96.6	29	96.7	76	84.4
7. Non-Applicable																						
8. Blank	1	2.1	1	8.3	1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											2	2.2
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
4A.																						
1. No	6	12.5			1	2.2	3	20.0	4	6.7	1	6.7	3	20.0			4	13.8	4	13.3	10	11.1
2.																						
3. Undecided	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
4.	5	10.4	2	16.7	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0											3	3.3
5. Yes	36	75.0	10	83.3	41	91.1	11	73.3	52	86.7	14	93.3	12	80.0	1	100.0	24	82.8	25	83.3	76	84.4
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
4B.																						
1. Parent knows child's needs, etc.	14	29.2	6	50.0	17	37.8	3	20.0	20	33.3	5	33.3	3	20.0			8	27.6	8	26.7	28	31.1
2. Make suggestions, state likes and dislikes	12	25.0	2	16.7	12	26.7	2	13.3	14	23.3	4	26.7	4	26.7			8	27.6	8	26.7	22	24.4
3. Helps the child	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7							1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
4. Parent involvement is important (for success)	8	16.7	3	25.0	6	13.3	5	33.3	11	18.3	2	13.3	4	26.7	1	100.0	5	17.2	6	20.0	17	18.9
5. Parents are concerned	1	2.1	1	8.3			2	13.3	2	3.3											2	2.2
6. Follow Through runs it fine	3	6.2			1	2.2	2	13.3	3	5.0	1	6.7	3	20.0			4	13.8	4	13.3	7	7.8
7. Not qualified to have voice in program	4	8.3			3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7											4	4.4
8. Undecided											2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7	2	2.2
9. Non-Applicable	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3											2	2.2
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L								COMMUNITY N								GRAND TOTAL	
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL			
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
5A.																						
1. Reading	10	20.8	5	25.0	10	22.2	5	20.0	15	21.7	6	33.3	7	46.7			15	51.7	15	50.0	26	51.1
2. ABC's	15	31.3	2	8.3	13	28.9	4	13.3	17	25.0	2	11.1	2	13.3			2	6.9	2	6.7	19	19.8
3. Writing	7	14.6	1	4.2	5	11.1	3	10.0	8	10.4	1	5.6	1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	9	9.4
4. Spelling	5	10.4			3	6.7	2	6.7	5	6.7	1	5.6	1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	6	6.3
5. Math	13	27.1	1	4.2	7	15.6	7	23.3	14	20.3	3	16.7	2	13.3			3	10.3	3	10.0	17	17.7
6. Homework	3	6.3			1	2.2	2	6.7	3	4.4											3	3.1
7. Arts and Crafts	4	8.3	1	4.2	3	6.7	2	6.7	5	7.2	2	11.1	1	6.7			3	10.3	3	10.0	8	8.3
8. Housework	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	3.3	2	2.9											2	2.1
9. Indoor & Outdoor Activities	13	27.1	1	4.2	11	24.4	3	10.0	14	20.3	1	5.6	1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	15	15.6
10. Lots of things	1	2.1	1	4.2	1	2.2	1	3.3	2	2.9											2	2.1
11. To express self	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.4											1	1.0
12. Nothing	6	12.5	1	4.2	4	8.9	3	10.0	7	10.1	1	5.6					1	3.4	1	3.3	8	8.3
13. General Help	4	8.3	1	4.2	4	8.9	1	3.3	5	7.2	1	5.6	1	6.7	1	100.0	2	6.9	3	10.0	8	8.3
14. Non-Applicable	1	2.1					1	3.3	1	1.4											1	1.0
15. Blank	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.4	1	5.6					1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.1
TOTALS *																						
5B.																						
1. No-no different	6	12.5	1	8.3	6	13.3	1	6.7	7	11.7	5	33.3	4	26.7			9	31.0	9	30.0	16	17.8
2.	3	6.3			2	4.4	1	3.3	3	5.0			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	4	4.4
3. Undecided	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	3.3	2	3.3											2	2.2
4.																						
5. Yes, I see different things	10	20.8	7	58.3	12	26.7	5	16.7	17	28.3	2	13.3	2	13.3			3	10.3	3	10.0	20	22.2
6. Non-applicable	27	56.3	4	33.3	23	51.1	8	26.7	31	51.7	5	33.3	6	40.0	1	100.0	14	48.3	15	50.0	46	51.1
7. Blank																						
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	13	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
5C.																						
1. Help w/tasks, schoolwork	24	50.0	8	66.7	22	48.9	10	66.7	32	53.3	3	20.0	4	26.7	1	100.0	6	20.7	7	23.3	39	43.3
2. Give child responsibilities	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
3. Indoor Activities (games, etc.)	4	8.3			3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7	2	13.3	1	6.7			3	10.3	3	10.0	7	7.8
4. Outdoor Activities																						
5. Indoor & Outdoor Activities	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
6. Discuss more things	3	6.3	1	8.3	4	8.9			4	6.7											4	4.4
7. Misc. things - things one does not ordinarily do	3	6.3			2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0	1	6.7	5	33.3			6	20.7	6	20.0	9	10.0
8. Non-Applicable	4	8.3	1	8.3	3	6.7	2	13.3	5	8.3	2	13.3	1	6.7			3	10.3	3	10.0	8	8.9
9. Blank because of ans. to a previous question	8	16.7	2	16.7	9	20.0	1	6.7	10	16.7	4	26.7	4	26.7			8	27.6	8	26.7	18	20.0
10. Blank																						
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
5D.																						
1. No	4	8.3	2	16.7	5	11.1	1	6.7	6	10.0	4	26.7	2	13.3			6	20.7	6	20.0	12	13.3
2.	2	4.2	1	8.3			2	13.3	2	3.3											2	2.2
3. Undecided	8	16.7			6	13.3	2	13.3	8	13.3											8	8.9
4.																						
5. Yes	32	66.7	9	75.0	32	71.1	9	60.0	41	68.3	11	73.3	13	86.7	1	100.0	23	79.3	24	80.0	65	72.2
6. Non-Applicable	2	4.2	1	8.3	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0											3	3.3
7. Blank																						
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
6A.																						
1. No-not at all	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	3	3.3
2.	1	2.1	3	25.0	3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7											4	4.4
3. Undecided																						
4. Yes, some progress made	12	25.0	1	8.3	12	26.7	1	6.7	13	21.7	2	13.3	3	20.0			5	17.2	5	16.7	18	20.0
5. Yes - a lot	27	56.3	7	58.3	25	55.6	9	60.0	34	56.7	11	73.3	9	60.0	1	100.0	13	44.8	14	46.7	48	53.3
6. Non-Applicable	4	8.3			3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	6	6.7
7. Blank	2	4.2	1	8.3			3	20.0	3	5.0			2	13.3			3	10.3	3	10.0	6	6.7
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

* Because of the multiple answers offered in 5A, totals were above 100%; therefore, they were deleted from the table.

09192

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L									COMMUNITY N									
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		GRAND TOTAL	
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%
6B.																				
1. None due to our program	3	6.3	1	8.3	4	8.9			4	6.7									4	4.4
2.	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7										
3. Undecided																				
4.	5	10.4	3	25.0	3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	3	10.0	7	7.8
5. Yes, a lot due to our program	34	70.8	4	33.3	28	62.2	10	66.7	38	63.3	10	66.7	8	53.3	1	100.0	17	58.6	18	60.0	56	62.2
6. Non-Applicable	2	4.2	3	25.0	2	4.4	1	20.0	3	5.0	1	6.7	1	6.7			7	24.1	7	23.3	10	11.1
7. Blank because of ans. to previous question											2	6.7	2	13.3			3	10.4	3	10.0	3	3.3
8. Blank	3	6.2	1	8.3	3	6.7	1	6.6	4	6.7											4	4.4
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
7A.																				
1. No, not at all	4	8.3	3	25.0	4	8.9	3	20.0	7	11.7	5	33.3	2	13.3			7	24.1	7	23.3	14	15.6
2.	1	2.1	1	8.3	2	4.4			2	3.3	1	6.7	3	20.0			4	13.8	4	13.3	5	5.6
3. Undecided	3	6.3			3	6.7			3	5.0												
4.	11	22.9	4	33.3	9	20.0	6	40.0	15	25.0	3	20.0	2	13.3			5	17.2	5	16.7	20	22.2
5. Yes, a lot	26	54.1	4	33.3	23	51.1	3	20.0	26	43.3	4	26.7	7	46.7	1	100.0	9	31.0	10	33.3	39	43.3
6. Non-Applicable	3	6.2			1	2.2	2	13.3	3	5.0			1	6.7			1	3.5	1	3.3	4	4.4
7. Blank	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7												
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
7B.																				
1. None, due to our program	3	6.3	3	25.0	2	4.4	4	26.7	6	10.0			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	7	7.8
2.	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3	2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7	4	4.4
3. Undecided	5	10.4			3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7	3	20.0					3	10.3	3	10.0	7	7.8
4.	9	18.7	2	16.7	10	22.2	1	6.7	11	18.3	5	33.3	1	6.7			5	17.2	5	16.7	16	17.8
5. A lot due to our program	22	45.8	5	41.7	21	46.7	6	40.0	27	45.0	3	20.0	3	20.0	1	100.0	7	24.1	8	26.7	35	38.9
6. Non-Applicable	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3			2	13.3			2	6.9	2	6.7	4	4.4
7. Blank because of ans. to previous question	1	2.1	1	8.3	1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3												
8. Blank	4	8.3	1	8.3	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0	1	6.7	2	13.3			3	10.3	3	10.0	6	6.7
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
8A.																				
1. No, not at all	3	6.3	1	8.3	1	2.2	3	20.0	4	6.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	5	5.6
2.	1	2.1	2	16.7	2	4.4			2	3.3			2	13.3			2	6.9	2	6.7	4	4.4
3. Undecided	3	6.2	2	16.7	3	6.7			3	5.0			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	4	4.4
4.																						
5. Yes	24	50.0	4	33.3	22	48.9	6	40.0	28	46.7	10	66.7	7	46.7	1	100.0	19	65.5	20	66.7	48	53.3
6. Non-Applicable	17	35.4	3	25.0	16	35.6	1	6.7	17	28.3	3	20.0	4	26.7			7	24.1	7	23.3	14	15.6
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
8B.																				
1. No, not at all	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
2.																						
3. Undecided	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3	3	20.0					3	10.3	3	10.0	5	5.6
4.	4	8.3	1	8.3	3	6.7	2	13.3	5	8.3	2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7	7	7.8
5. Yes	17	35.4	2	16.7	14	31.1	5	33.3	19	31.7	6	40.0	5	33.3	1	100.0	12	41.4	13	43.3	32	35.6
6. Non-Applicable	9	18.8			7	15.6	2	13.3	9	15.0	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	10	11.1
7. Blank because of ans. to previous question	6	12.5	3	25.0	3	6.7	6	40.0	9	15.0			5	33.3			5	17.2	5	16.7	14	15.6
8. Blank	9	18.8	3	25.0	11	24.4	1	6.7	12	20.0	1	6.7	2	13.3			3	10.3	3	10.0	15	16.7
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
8C.																				
1. No, not at all	1	2.1	1	8.3	2	4.4			2	3.3									2	2.2
2.											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
3. Undecided	3	6.3	1	8.3	2	4.4	2	13.3	4	6.7	2	13.3					3	10.3	3	10.0	7	7.8
4.	1	2.1	1	8.3	2	4.4			2	3.3											2	2.2
5. Yes	27	56.3	3	25.0	23	51.1	7	46.7	30	50.0	8	53.3	6	40.0	1	100.0	15	51.7	16	53.3	46	51.1
6. Non-Applicable	15	31.3	2	16.7	13	28.9	4	26.7	17	28.3	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	4	4.4
7. Blank	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7												
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
8D.																				
1. No, not at all	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	3	3.3
2.	3	6.3			1	2.2	2	13.3	3	5.0												
3. Undecided	3	6.3			1	2.2	2	13.3	3	5.0											3	3.3
4.	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											2	2.2
5. Yes	15	31.3	7	58.3	19	42.2	3	20.0	22	36.7	10	66.7	3	20.0	1	100.0	11	37.9	12	40.0	34	37.8
6. Non-Applicable	10	20.8	1	8.3	9	20.0	2	13.3	11	18.3	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	12	13.3
7. Blank because of ans. to previous question	1	2.1	3	25.0	2	4.4	2	13.3	4	6.7			8	53.3			8	27.6	8	26.7	12	13.3
8. Blank	12	25.0	1	8.3	13	28.9			13	21.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	14	15.6
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

03193

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L									COMMUNITY M									
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL	GRAND TOTAL
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	freq
9E.																			
1. No, not at all	3	6.3	1	8.3	2	4.4	2	13.3	4	1	6.7	1	6.7	1	100.0	2	6.9	2	6.7
2.	2	4.2			2	4.4			2										
3. Undecided																			
4.																			
5. Yes	3	6.3																	
6. Non-Applicable	25	52.1	5	41.7	22	48.9	8	53.3	30			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3
7. Blank	11	22.9	6	50.0	14	31.1	3	20.0	17	12	80.0	12	80.0	1	100.0	23	79.3	24	80.0
TOTALS	1	2.1			1	2.2			1							1	3.4	1	3.3
	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0
9F.																			
1. No, not at all	2	4.2			2	4.4			2										
2.	3	6.3			2	4.4	1	6.7	3										
3. Undecided	2	4.2			2	4.4			2										
4.	5	10.4	1	8.3	4	8.9	2	13.3	6	2	13.3	1	6.7	1	100.0	2	6.9	2	10.0
5. Yes	19	39.6	2	16.7	17	37.8	2	13.3	19	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7
6. Non-Applicable	8	16.7	4	33.3	9	20.0	3	20.0	12	11	73.3	11	73.3			15	51.7	15	50.0
7. Blank because of an answer to a previous question												1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3
8. Blank	4	8.3	3	25.0	2	4.4	5	33.3	7										
TOTALS	5	10.4	2	16.7	9	20.0	2	13.3	11			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3
	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0
9H.																			
1. No	35	72.9	7	58.3	31	68.9	11	73.3	42	5	33.3	10	66.7	1	100.0	14	48.3	15	50.0
2.	1	2.1			1	2.2			1										
3. Undecided	6	12.5	1	8.3	5	11.1	2	13.3	7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3
4.	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7
5. Yes	5	10.4	4	33.3	7	15.6	2	13.3	9	3	20.0	3	20.0			4	13.8	4	13.3
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	4	26.7	2	13.3			8	27.6	6	20.0
										15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0
9I.																			
1. No	15	31.3	3	25.0	14	31.1	4	26.7	18	6	40.0	8	53.3	1	100.0	13	44.8	14	46.7
2.	16	33.3	5	41.7	12	26.7	7	46.7	19	3	20.0	3	20.0			6	20.7	6	20.0
3. Undecided	5	10.4	2	16.7	5	11.1	2	13.3	7	1	6.7	1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3
4.	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3
5. Yes	11	22.9	2	16.7	13	28.9			13	3	20.0	3	20.0			6	20.7	6	20.0
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	1	6.7					2	6.9	2	6.7
										15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0
10A.																			
1. No	14	29.2	2	16.7	12	26.7	4	26.7	16	3	20.0	1	6.7	1	100.0	3	10.3	4	13.3
2.	1	2.1	2	16.7	1	2.2	2	13.3	3										
3. Undecided	14	29.2	4	33.3	12	26.7	6	40.0	18	4	26.7	3	20.0			7	24.1	7	23.3
4.	4	8.3	1	8.3	3	6.7	2	13.3	5	2	13.3	2	13.3			4	13.8	4	13.3
5. Yes	14	29.2	3	25.0	13	28.9	1	6.7	14	1	6.7	9	60.0			10	34.5	10	33.3
6. Non-Applicable																			
7. Blank	1	2.1			1	2.2			1										
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0
10B.																			
1. No	16	33.3	3	25.0	15	33.3	4	26.7	19	7	46.7	7	46.7	1	100.0	13	44.8	14	46.7
2.	10	20.8	3	25.0	8	17.8	5	33.3	13	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3
3. Undecided	7	14.6	2	16.7	5	11.1	4	26.7	9										
4.	3	6.3	1	8.3	3	6.7	1	6.7	4										
5. Yes	12	25.0	3	25.0	14	31.1	1	6.7	15	7	46.7	8	53.3			15	51.7	15	50.0
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0
11A.																			
1. No	32	66.7	8	66.7	30	66.7	10	66.7	40	12	80.0	12	80.0	1	100.0	23	79.3	24	80.0
2.																			
3. Undecided																			
4.																			
5. Yes	1	2.1			1	2.2			1										
TOTALS	15	31.2	4	33.3	14	31.1	5	33.3	19	3	20.0	3	20.0			6	20.7	6	20.0
	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0
11B.																			
1. Once	5	10.4	1	8.3	6	13.3			6	3	20.0	4	26.7			7	24.1	7	23.3
2. Twice	6	12.5	1	8.3	3	6.7	4	26.7	7										
3. Three times	1	2.1	2	16.7	2	4.4	1	6.7	3			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3
4. Once every three months	2	4.2			2	4.4			2										
5. Twice a month	1	2.1			1	2.2			1										
6. Once a week	1	2.1			1	2.2			1										
7. Non-Applicable																			
8. Blank because of ans. to previous question																			
TOTALS	32	66.7	8	66.7	30	66.7	10	66.7	40	12	80.0	10	66.7	1	100.0	21	72.4	22	73.3
	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0

09191

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L										COMMUNITY N										GRAND TOTAL	
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL			
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%
11C.																						
1. Parent-Educator	9	18.8			8	17.8	1	6.7	9	15.0	2	13.3	4	26.7			6	20.7	6	20.0	15	16.7
2. Herself	7	14.6	4	33.3	7	15.6	4	26.7	11	18.3											11	12.2
3. Other: another teacher											1	6.7					1	3.5	1	3.3	1	1.1
4. Non-Applicable													1	6.7			1	3.5	1	3.3	1	1.1
5. Blank because of ans. to previous question	32	66.7	8	66.7	30	66.7	10	66.7	40	66.7	12	80.0	9	60.0	1	100.0	20	68.9	21	70.0	61	67.8
6. Blank													1	6.7			1	3.5	1	3.3	1	1.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
11D.																						
1. We communicate by phone																						
2. See parent educator at school																						
3. Non-Applicable																						
4. Blank because of ans. to previous question	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	14	93.3	15	100.0	1	100.0	28	96.6	29	96.7	89	98.9
5. Blank											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
11E.																						
1. To discuss chi	8	16.7	2	16.7	9	20.0	1	6.7	10	16.7	1	6.7	2	13.3			3	10.3	3	10.0	13	14.4
2. To discuss school-work	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	3	3.3
3. Talk about Follow Through & any problems with task or work	3	6.3			2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	4	4.4
4. Just to talk and bet acquainted	3	6.3	2	16.7	2	4.4	3	20.0	5	8.3	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	7	7.8
5. Non-Applicable	1	2.1			1	2.2			1												1	1.1
6. Blank because of ans. to previous question	32	66.7	8	66.7	30	66.7	10	66.7	40	66.7	11	73.3	10	66.7	1	100.0	20	69.0	21	70.0	61	67.8
7. Blank																	1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
12A.																						
1. No	25	52.0	4	33.3	21	46.7	8	53.3	29	48.3	9	60.0	12	80.0	1	100.0	20	69.0	21	70.0	50	55.6
2.	7	14.6	3	25.0	6	13.3	2	13.3	10	16.7	1	6.7	2	13.3			2	6.9	2	6.7	12	13.3
3. Undecided	5	10.4			2	4.4	3	20.0	5	8.3							2	6.9	2	6.7	7	7.8
4.	6	12.5	3	25.0	4	8.9	2	13.3	6	10.0											6	6.7
5. Yes	5	10.4	2	16.7	5	11.1			5	8.3	4	26.7	1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	10	11.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
12B.																						
1. Would be helpful, help child, help parents	2	4.2	2	16.7	2	4.4	2	13.3	4	6.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	5	5.6
2. Keep in contact, communication important	7	14.6	1	8.3	7	15.6	1	6.7	8	13.3	1	6.7	2	13.3			3	10.3	3	10.0	11	12.2
3. Important for teachers to know home environment	1	2.1	1	8.3	2	4.4			2	3.3	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	3	3.3
4. Can't leave the class, not enough time, too much for her to do	27	56.3	5	41.7	22	48.9	10	66.7	32	53.3	7	46.7	8	53.3			15	51.7	15	50.0	47	52.2
5. PE can do the job	3	6.3			3	6.7			3	5.0											3	3.3
6. The classroom is more important	2	4.2	1	8.3	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0											3	3.3
7. Non-Applicable													1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	2	2.2
8. Blank	6	12.5	2	16.7	5	11.1	1	6.7	6	10.0	4	26.7	1	6.7	1	100.0	8	24.1	8	26.7	16	17.8
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
12C.																						
1. No	24	50.0	8	66.7	22	48.9	10	66.7	32	53.3	14	93.3	15	100.0	1	100.0	28	96.6	29	96.7	61	67.8
2.	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											2	2.2
3. Undecided	6	12.5	2	16.7	5	11.1	1	6.7	6	10.0											6	6.7
4.	5	10.4	1	8.3	5	11.1			5	8.3											5	5.6
5. Yes	9	18.8	1	8.3	10	22.2			10	16.7							1	3.4	1	3.3	11	12.2
6. Non-Applicable																						
7. Blank	2	4.2					3	20.0	3	5.0	1	6.7									4	4.4
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

09105

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L										COMMUNITY N										GRAND TOTAL	
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL			
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%
12D.																						
1. After school, on her own time, weekends	10	22.1	3	25.0	11	24.4	2	13.3	13	21.7											13	14.4
2. Give her time off from her teaching to do it	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	3	3.3
3. She could come if she wanted to	3	6.3			3	6.7	1	6.7	3	5.0											3	3.3
4. Do not know	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3											2	2.2
5. Non-Applicable	6	13.0			6	13.3	1	6.7	7	11.7											7	7.8
6. Blank because of ans. to previous question	23	48.0	8	66.7	21	46.7	10	66.7	31	51.7	14	93.3	15	100.0	1	100.0	28	96.6	29	96.7	60	66.7
7. Blank	1	2.1	1	8.3	1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											2	2.2
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
12H.																						
1. Once a week	3	6.3			2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	4	4.4
2. Twice a month	3	6.3			3	6.7			3	5.0											3	3.3
3. Once a month	5	10.4	2	16.7	6	13.3	1	6.7	7	11.7											7	7.8
4. Once every six weeks	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
5. Whenever possible	2	4.2	2	16.7	3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7											4	4.4
6. Once a semester	3	6.3			3	6.7			3	5.0											3	3.3
7. Once a year	3	6.3	1	8.3	2	4.4	2	13.3	4	6.7											4	4.4
8. Non-Applicable	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
9. Blank because of ans. to previous question	26	54.1	7	58.3	23	51.1	10	66.7	33	55.0	14	93.3	15	100.0	1	100.0	28	96.6	29	96.7	62	68.9
10. Blank	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
12F.																						
1. Pay teacher for extra work	6	12.5	1	8.3	5	11.1	2	13.3	7	11.7											7	7.8
2. Give day off, shorten teaching day	3	6.3			2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0			1	6.7			1	3.5	1	3.3	4	4.4
3. Supply aides, substitutes, parent volunteers, team teaching	5	10.4			5	11.1			5	8.3	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	7	7.8
4. Should be part of the teacher's job	3	6.3			3	6.7			3	5.0											3	3.3
5. Shouldn't send teachers to the home, do not approve of it, almost impossible	1	2.1	1	8.3	2	4.4			2	3.3											2	2.2
6. Same manner as Follow Through			2	16.7	1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											2	2.2
7. Don't know	15	31.3			11	24.4	4	26.7	15	25.0	3	20.0					3	10.3	3	10.0	18	20.0
8. Non-Applicable	2	4.3			2	4.4			2	3.3											3	3.3
9. Blank	12	25.0	8	66.7	13	31.1	6	40.0	20	33.3	11	73.3	14	93.3	1	100.0	23	79.3	24	80.0	44	48.9
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
11A.																						
1. No	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3	2	13.3	1	6.7			3	10.3	3	10.0	5	5.6
2.	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
3. Undecided											1	6.7					1	3.5	1	3.3	2	2.2
4.	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
5. Yes	41	91.7	12	100.0	41	91.1	15	100.0	56	93.3	12	80.0	14	93.3	1	100.0	25	86.2	26	86.7	82	91.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
11B.																						
1. No	44	91.7	12	100.0	41	91.1	15	100.0	56	93.3	12	80.0	13	86.7	1	100.0	24	82.8	25	83.3	81	90.0
2.											1	6.7					1	3.5	1	3.3	1	1.1
3. Undecided	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
4.																						
5. Yes	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
6. Non-Applicable																						
7. Blank because of ans. to previous question	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3	2	13.3	1	6.7			3	10.3	3	10.0	5	5.6
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L									COMMUNITY S									GRAND TOTAL	
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq
13C.																				
1. Not used to talking to teachers										1	6.7					1	3.5	1	3.3	1
2. Teacher not interested																				
3. All teacher does is giggle																				
4. Teacher didn't follow instructions about my child's behavior	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7										1
5. Teacher doesn't like parents in classroom - strained relationships																				
6. Teacher puts down parent-educator	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7										1
7. Non-Applicable	1	2.1	1	8.3	2	4.4			2	3.3	1	6.7	2	8.7			2	6.7	2	4.4
8. Blank because of ans. to previous question	43	89.6	11	91.7	41	91.1	13	86.7	54	90.0	13	86.7	14	93.3	1	100.0	26	89.7	27	90.0	81	90.0
9. Blank	2	4.2			2	4.4	2	13.3	4	6.7										
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
14A.																				
1. No	46	95.8	11	91.7	42	93.3	15	100.0	57	95.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	87	96.7
2.																				
3. Undecided			1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7										1
4.																				
5. Yes	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3										2
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
14B.																				
1. Parent Educator doesn't give me all the tasks - makes excuses for not delivering them			1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7										1
2. Non-Applicable											1	6.7	2	13.3			3	10.3	3	10.0	3	3.3
3. Blank because of ans. to previous question	48	100.0	11	91.7	44	97.8	15	100.0	59	98.3	14	93.3	13	86.7	1	100.0	26	89.7	27	90.0	86	95.6
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
15A.																				
1. No	44	91.7	11	91.7	41	91.1	14	93.3	55	91.7	14	93.3	15	100.0	1	100.0	28	96.6	29	96.7	84	93.3
2.	1	2.1	1	8.3	2	4.4			2	3.3										2
3. Undecided																				
4.	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	3	3.3
5. Yes	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7										1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
15B.																				
1. Problems arranging meeting time																				
2. Problem communicating about tasks	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3										2
3. Teacher does not accept me																				
4. Uneasiness when teacher comes into home																				
5. Non-Applicable	1	2.1					1	6.7	1	1.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
6. Blank because of ans. to previous question	44	91.7	12	100.0	42	93.3	14	93.3	56	93.3	14	93.3	15	100.0	1	100.0	28	96.6	29	96.7	85	94.4
7. Blank	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7										1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
16A.																				
1. Home	42	87.5	10	83.3	39	86.7	13	86.7	52	86.7	11	73.3	11	73.3	1	100.0	21	72.4	23	73.3	74	82.2
2. School	3	6.3	1	8.3	3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7			3	20.0			3	10.3	3	10.0	7	7.8
3. Elsewhere: home or school	3	6.3			2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0	2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7	5	5.6
4. Elsewhere: work											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
5. Elsewhere: anywhere, wherever most convenient for both people			1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.4
6. Non-Applicable											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
7. Blank																				
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L										COMMUNITY S										GRAND TOTAL	
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL			
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%
16B.																						
1. More privacy	5	10.4	2	16.7	4	8.9	3	20.0	7	11.7											7	7.8
2. More convenience	18	36.3	6	50.0	14	33.3	8	53.3	32	53.0	15	100.0	12	80.0			20	69.0	20	66.7	53	58.9
3. Convenience and privacy	5	10.4	1	8.3	5	11.1	1	6.7	6	10.0	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.8	2	6.7	8	8.9
4. Important to observe the child's home or school environment	4	8.3	2	16.7	6	13.3			6	10.0			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	7	7.8
5. More time available	6	12.5	1	8.3	5	11.1	2	13.3	7	11.7	1	6.7	1	6.7	1	100.0	1	3.4	2	6.7	9	10.0
6. Child more secure																	1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
7. Non-Applicable	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7	2	13.3					2	6.8	2	6.7	3	3.3
8. Blank											2	13.3					2	6.8	2	6.7	2	2.2
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
17A.																						
1. Less than a month			2	16.7			2	13.3	2	3.3											2	2.2
2. Once a month	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
3. Once every 3 weeks																						
4. Once every 2 weeks	2	4.2	1	8.3	3	6.7			3	5.0											3	3.2
5. Once a week or more	44	91.7	9	75.0	41	91.1	12	80.0	53	88.3	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	83	92.2
6. Non-Applicable	1	2.1					1	6.7	1	1.7											1	1.1
7. Blank																						
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
17B.																						
1. Too much	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3	2	13.3	1	6.7	1	100.0	3	10.3	3	10.0	5	5.6
2.																						
3. Just right	43	89.6	10	83.3	41	91.1	12	80.0	53	88.3	13	86.7	14	93.3			26	89.7	27	90.0	80	88.9
4.																						
5. Too little	3	6.3	2	16.7	2	4.4	3	20.0	5	8.3											5	5.6
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
18A.																						
1. No - very Uncomfortable																						
2.			1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
3. Undecided	2	4.2	1	8.3	3	6.7			3	5.0											3	3.3
4.	4	8.3	1	8.3	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0							1	3.4	1	3.3	4	4.4
5. Yes, very Comfortable	42	87.5	8	66.7	37	82.2	13	86.7	50	83.3	14	93.3	13	86.7	1	100.0	26	89.7	27	90.0	77	85.6
6. Non-Applicable																	2	6.9	2	6.7	2	2.2
7. Blank			1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
18B.																						
1. My nervousness																						
2. Parent educator is strange, don't like her	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
3. Came too frequently													1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
4. She only talks about one child																						
5. Non-Applicable	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
6. Blank because of ans. to previous question	46	95.8	10	83.3	42	93.3	14	93.3	56	93.3	15	100.0	13	86.7	1	100.0	27	93.1	28	93.3	84	93.3
7. Blank			2	16.7	1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3												
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
19.																						
1. No											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
2.	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7												
3. Undecided	4	8.3			2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0	2	13.3	1	6.7			3	10.3	3	10.0	6	6.7
4.	1	2.1	1	8.3	2	4.4			2	3.3											2	2.2
5. Yes	42	87.5	10	83.3	40	88.9	12	80.0	52	86.7	12	80.0	13	86.7	1	100.0	24	82.8	25	83.3	77	85.6
6. Non-Applicable																	1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
7. Blank			1	8.3	1	2.2	1	6.7	1	1.7												
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
20A.																						
1. Too Difficult																						
2.	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	3	3.3
3. Just right	41	85.4	9	75.0	37	82.2	13	86.7	50	83.3	11	73.3	12	80.0	1	100.0	22	75.9	23	76.7	73	81.1
4.	2	4.2	1	8.3	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0	3	20.0	3	20.0			6	20.7	6	20.0	9	10.0
5. Too easy	3	6.3	2	16.7	4	8.9	1	6.7	5	8.3											5	5.6
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L										COMMUNITY N										GRAND TOTAL	
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL			
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%
20B.																						
1. No	6	12.5	2	16.7	1	2.2	1	26.7	8	13.3	2	13.3	2	13.3	1	100.0	3	10.3	4	13.3	12	13.3
2.	3	6.3																				
3. Undecided																						
4.																						
5. Yes	5	10.4	4	33.3	3	6.6	2	13.3	9	15.0							2	6.9	2	6.7	11	12.2
6. Non-Applicable	32	66.7	6	50.0	41	91.1	12	80.0	53	88.3	13	86.7	13	86.7			24	82.8	24	80.0	77	85.6
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
20C.																						
1. No	14	29.2	4	33.3	10	22.2	8	53.3	18	30.0	12	80.0	6	40.0	1	100.0	17	58.7	18	60.0	36	40.0
2.			1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
3. Undecided																						
4.																						
5. Yes	34	70.8	7	58.3	34	75.6	7	46.7	41	68.3	3	20.0	9	60.0			11	37.9	11	36.7	52	57.8
6. Non-Applicable																	1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
7. Blank																						
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
20C. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT IT																						
1. Liked it, good	13	27.1	2	16.7	13	28.9	2	13.3	15	25.0			3	20.0			3	10.3	3	10.0	18	20.0
2. All right, didn't mind	15	31.3	1	8.3	13	28.9	3	20.0	16	26.7			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	17	18.9
3. Nervous, Embarrassed	4	8.3	1	8.3	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0	2	13.3	6	40.0			9	27.6	8	26.7	11	12.2
4. Didn't like it, unnecessary	1	2.1	2	16.7	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0											1	1.1
5. No comment			1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7							1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
6. Non-Applicable	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7												
7. Blank	14	29.2	5	41.7	11	24.4	8	53.3	19	31.7	13	86.7	4	26.7	1	100.0	16	55.2	17	56.7	36	40.0
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
20C. WHY																						
1. Help the child	12	25.0			10	22.2	2	13.3	12	20.0			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	13	14.4
2. Didn't mind, nice	2	8.3	1	8.3	3	6.7	2	13.3	5	8.3											5	5.6
3. Learn something	6	12.5			6	13.3			6	10.0			3	13.3			2	6.9	2	6.7	8	8.9
4. Embarrassed											1	6.7	3	20.0			4	13.8	4	13.3	4	4.4
5. Acting like a child	3	6.3	1	8.3	4	8.9			4	6.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	5	5.6
6. Time consuming, not necessary	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7	1	6.7	3	20.0			4	13.8	4	13.3	5	5.6
7. Non-Applicable	1	2.1	1	8.3	1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3												
8. Blank	21	43.8	9	75.0	20	44.4	10	66.7	30	50.0	12	80.0	6	40.0	1	100.0	17	58.6	18	60.0	48	53.3
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
20D.																						
1. No	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
2.			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7												
3. Undecided .	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	3	5.0	1	6.7			1	100.0			1	3.3	3	3.3
4.	3	6.3	2	16.7	2	4.4	1	6.7	5	8.3	1	6.7	3	20.0			4	13.8	4	13.3	9	10.0
5. Yes	42	87.5	9	75.0	39	86.7	12	80.0	51	85.0	12	80.0	12	80.0			24	82.8	24	80.0	75	83.3
TOTAL	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
20Da. IF ANSWER IS NO																						
1. Should relate more to schoolwork	1	2.1	1	8.3			2	13.3	2	3.3											2	2.2
2. Need to be a little harder											2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7	2	2.2
3. Some are silly											1	6.7			1	100.0			1	3.3	1	1.1
4. Non-Applicable	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
5. Blank because of ans. to previous question	42	87.5	11	91.7	40	88.9	13	86.7	52	86.7	12	80.0	15	100.0			27	93.1	27	90.0	79	87.8
6. Blank	4	8.3			4	8.9			5	8.4											5	5.6
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
20E.																						
1. No--not at all											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
2.																						
3. Undecided	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
4.	14	29.2	2	16.7	13	28.9	3	20.0	16	26.7	3	20.0	6	40.0	1	100.0	8	27.6	9	30.0	25	27.8
5. Yes, very much	33	68.7	10	83.3	31	68.9	12	80.0	43	71.6	10	66.7	9	60.0			19	65.5	19	63.3	62	68.9
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
20F.																						
1. No	19	39.6	6	50.0	20	44.4	5	33.3	25	41.7	2	13.3	1	6.7			3	10.3	3	10.0	28	31.1
2.																						
3. Undecided	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
4.	1	2.1	1	8.3	2	4.4			2	3.3											2	2.2
5. Yes	19	39.6	4	33.3	16	35.6	7	46.7	23	38.3	11	73.3	11	73.3	1	100.0	21	72.4	22	73.3	45	50.0
6. Non-Applicable	7	14.6	1	8.3	6	13.3	2	13.3	8	13.3											8	8.9
7. Blank because of ans. to previous question											3	20.0					3	10.3	3	10.0	3	3.3
8. Blank	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7	2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7	3	3.3
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L										COMMUNITY N										GRAND TOTAL	
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL			
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%
20F. HOW HAVE THEY HELPED																						
1. Tasks have helped them			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7			2	13.3			2	6.9	2	6.7	3	3.3
2. Other children help with tasks	18	37.5	1	8.3	15	33.3	4	26.7	19	31.7	8	53.3	3	20.0	1	100.0	10	34.5	11	36.7	30	33.3
3. Have been influenced	3	6.2	2	16.7	3	6.7	2	13.3	5	8.3	3	20.0	6	40.0			9	31.0	9	30.0	14	15.6
4. Other children too young			2	16.7	1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	3	3.3
5. Too much age difference			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7											1	1.1
6. Not affected	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	3	3.3
7. Non-Applicable	2	4.2	1	8.3	3	6.7			3	5.0											3	3.3
8. Blank because of ans. to a previous question	20	41.7	3	25.0	18	40.0	5	33.3	23	38.3	1	6.7	3	20.0			4	13.8	4	13.3	27	30.0
9. Blank	3	6.2	1	8.3	3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7	2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7	6	6.7
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
21.																						
1. Comprehensive services offered in the community that Follow Through helps with	21	43.7	3	25.0	21	46.7	3	20.0	24	40.0	3	20.0	1	6.7			4	13.8	4	13.3	28	31.1
2. Child's performance in school	7	14.6	4	33.3	5	11.1	6	40.0	11	18.3	6	40.0	4	26.7	1	100.0	9	31.0	10	33.3	21	23.3
3. Comprehensive services and child's performance in school	8	16.7			6	13.3	2	13.3	8	13.3	2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7	10	11.1
4. PAC meetings	1	2.1											1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
5. Child rearing	1	2.1	2	16.7	3	6.7			3	5.0			3	20.0			3	10.3	3	10.0	6	6.7
6. Time spent with children in Follow Through	1	2.1					1	6.7	1	1.7											1	1.1
7. Talk generally about school, family, and community	3	6.2	2	16.7	5	11.1			5	8.3	4	26.7	5	33.3			9	31.0	9	30.0	14	15.6
8. Nothing else	6	12.5			5	11.1	1	6.7	6	10.0			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	7	7.8
9. Non-Applicable			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7											1	1.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
22A.																						
1. No, not at all	25	52.1	6	50.0	24	53.3	7	46.7	31	51.7	9	60.0	3	20.0	1	100.0	11	37.9	12	40.0	43	47.8
2. Hardly ever	2	4.2	1	8.3	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	5	5.6
3. Sometimes	19	39.6	3	25.0	15	33.3	7	46.7	22	36.7	5	33.3	10	66.7			15	51.7	15	50.0	37	41.1
4. Yes, very often	2	4.2	2	16.7	3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	5	5.6
5. Undecided																						
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
22B. SUGGESTIONS ABOUT																						
1. Tasks	9	18.8	2	16.7	8	17.8	3	20.0	11	18.3	2	13.3	7	46.7			9	31.0	9	30.0	20	22.2
2. Schoolwork	2	4.2	1	8.3	1	2.2	2	13.3	3	5.0	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	5	5.6
3. Activities, Social Clubs, Trips, etc.	3	6.3	1	8.3	3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7											4	4.4
4. PAC Meetings	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											2	2.2
5. Comprehensive services in the community	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
6. Parent-educator's job	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7			3	20.0			3	10.3	3	10.0	4	4.4
7. Parental involvement	2	4.2	1	8.3	3	6.7			3	5.0	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	4	4.4
8. No suggestions	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
9. Non-Applicable	3	6.3			2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	5	5.6
10. Blank because of ans. to a previous question	24	50.0	7	58.3	24	53.3	7	46.7	31	51.7	10	66.7	3	20.0	1	100.0	13	41.4	13	43.3	44	48.9
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
22C.																						
1. No	5	10.4	2	16.7	4	8.9	3	20.0	7	11.7			2	13.3			2	6.9	2	6.7	9	10.0
2.	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											2	2.2
3. Undecided	2	4.2	2	16.7	2	4.4	2	13.3	4	6.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	5	5.6
4.													2	13.3			2	6.9	2	6.7	2	2.2
5. Yes	13	27.1	2	16.7	12	26.7	3	20.0	15	25.0	4	26.7	8	53.3			12	41.4	12	40.0	27	30.0
6. Non-Applicable																						
7. Blank because of an ans. to a previous question	25	52.1	5	41.7	24	53.3	6	40.0	30	50.0	9	60.0	3	20.0	1	100.0	11	37.9	12	40.0	42	46.7
8. Blank	1	2.1	1	8.3	2	4.4			2	3.3	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	3	3.3
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY I										COMMUNITY II									
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		GRAND TOTAL	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
23A.																						
1. No			2	16.7			2	13.3	2	3.3											2	2.2
2.	1	2.1	1	8.3	1	[illegible]	1	[illegible]	2	3.3											2	2.2
3. Uncertain																						
4.																						
5. Yes	3	6.3	1	8.3	2	[illegible]	1	[illegible]	3	[illegible]			2	13.3			2	6.9	2	[illegible]	4	[illegible]
6. Non-Applicable	44	91.7	8	66.7	41	[illegible]	12	80.0	53	88.3	14	93.3	13	86.7	1	100.0	25	86.2	27	90.0	81	90.0
7. Blank																						
TOTALS											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
23B.																						
1. Learning about closer communication with child	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3	2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7	4	4.4
2. Learning about child's behaviors & abilities at school	32	66.7	5	41.7	26	57.8	11	73.3	37	61.7	7	46.7	13	86.7			20	69.0	20	66.7	57	63.3
3. How to work better with my child (learning & Understanding)	3	6.3	1	8.3	3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7	1	6.7			1	100.0			1	3.3	5	5.6
4. Learning more about the purposes of the tasks	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
5. Learning to appreciate the child more	3	6.3	2	16.7	5	11.1			5	8.3	2	13.3	1	6.7			3	10.3	3	10.0	8	8.9
6. Don't know, hard to say	4	8.3			4	8.9			4	6.7	2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7	6	6.7
7. Non-Applicable	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	3	3.3
8. Blank because of ans. to a previous question	1	2.1	4	33.3	2	4.4	3	20.0	5	8.3											5	5.6
9. Blank											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
24.																						
1. No	21	43.8	7	58.3	21	46.7	7	46.7	28	46.7	6	40.0	4	26.7	1	100.0	9	31.0	10	33.3	38	42.2
2.	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3											2	2.2
3. Undecided	1	2.1			1	[illegible]			1	1.7											1	1.1
4.	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3											2	2.2
5. Yes	22	45.8	5	41.7	19	42.2	8	53.3	27	45.0	9	60.0	11	73.3			19	65.5	20	66.7	47	52.2
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
25A.																						
1. No																						
2.																						
3. Undecided											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
4.																						
5. Yes	47	97.9	12	100.0	43	[illegible]	15	100.0	59	98.3	13	93.3	15	100.0	1	100.0	28	96.6	29	96.7	88	97.8
6. Non-Applicable																						
7. Blank	1	2.1			1	[illegible]			1	1.7											1	1.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
25B.																						
1. No	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
2.																						
3. Undecided	2	4.2			2	[illegible]			2	[illegible]											2	[illegible]
4.																						
5. Yes	44	91.7	12	100.0	41	[illegible]	15	100.0	56	[illegible]	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	86	95.6
6. Non-Applicable																						
7. Blank	1	2.1			1	[illegible]			1	[illegible]											1	[illegible]
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	[illegible]	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
25C.																						
1. Non-Applicable	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
2. Blank because of ans. to a previous question																						
3. Blank	47	97.9	12	100.0	44	97.8	15	100.0	59	98.3	13	86.7	15	100.0	1	100.0	27	93.1	28	93.3	87	96.7
TOTALS											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
26A.																						
1. No, never	10	20.8	2	16.6	11	24.4	1	6.6	12	20	6	40.0	4	26.7			10	34.5	10	33.3	22	24.4
2. Yes, sometimes	24	50.0	5	41.7	25	[illegible]	4	26.7	29	48.3	5	33.3	1	100.0	1	100.0	11	41.4	13	43.3	42	46.7
3. Yes, often	14	29.2	5	41.7	9	[illegible]	10	66.7	19	[illegible]	1	6.7					6	20.0	7	[illegible]	26	[illegible]
4. Undecided																						
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	[illegible]	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L										COMMUNITY N									
	QUALIFIED		NOT QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NOT QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL	
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%
26B.																				
1. Just observed	16	33.3	6	50.0	17	37.8	5	33.3	22	36.6	2	13.3	3	33.3			7	24.1	7	23.3
2. Worked with kids	10	20.8	2	16.7	7	15.6	5	33.3	12	20.0	4	26.7					6	20.7	6	20.0
3. Did things for teacher	6	12.5	2	16.7	4	8.9	4	26.6	8	13.3	2	13.3					3	10.3	3	10.0
4. Parent-teacher conference	5	10.4			2	11.1			3	8.3	2	13.3	1	100.0	3	10.3	4	13.3	9	
5. Non-Applicable	1	2.1			1				1											
6. Blank because of ans. to a previous question	10	20.8	2	16.7	11	24.4	1	6.7	12	20.0	6	40.0	4	26.7			10	34.5	10	33.3
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0
26C.																				
1. No, not at all	3	6.3	1	8.3	4	8.9			4	6.7	5	33.3					1	3.4	1	3.3
2.	3	6.3			3	6.7			3	5.0			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3
3. Undecided	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3										
4.	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7										
5. Yes, very much			1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7										
6. Non-Applicable	1	2.1					1	6.7	1	1.7										
7. Blank because of ans. to a previous question	38	79.2	10	83.3	34	75.6	14	93.3	48	80.0	9	60.0	11	73.3	1	100.0	19	65.5	20	66.7
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0
26D.																				
1. No, not accepted	2	4.2	2	16.7	3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7	4	26.7	2	13.3			6	20.7	6	20.0
2.	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7										
3. Undecided	2	4.2																		
4.	6	12.5	1	8.3	4	8.9	2	13.3	6	10.0	2	13.3					1	3.4	1	3.3
5. Yes, very much	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3							3	10.3	2	6.7
6. Non-Applicable	37	77.1	9	75.0	32	71.1	14	93.3	46	76.7	9	60.0	11	73.3	1	100.0	19	65.5	20	66.7
7. Blank because of ans. to a previous question	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0
TOTALS																				
26F.																				
1. Working, didn't have time	3	6.3	1	8.3	4	8.9			4	6.7	5	33.3	3	20.0			8	27.6	8	26.7
2. Not invited	3	6.3			3	6.7			3	5.0			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3
3. Young children at home	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3										
4. Transportation problem	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7										
5. Other: Distance too far			1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7										
6. Other: Prefer to stay at home	1	2.1					1	6.7	1	1.7										
7. Other: Health reasons																				
8. Non-Applicable																				
9. Blank because of ans. to a previous question	38	79.2	10	83.3	34	75.6	14	93.3	48	80.0	9	60.0	11	73.3	1	100.0	19	65.5	20	66.7
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0
26P.																				
1. No	2	4.2	2	16.7	3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7	4	26.7	2	13.3			6	20.7	6	20.0
2.	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7										
3. Undecided	2	4.2																		
4.	6	12.5	1	8.3	4	8.9	2	13.3	6	10.0	2	13.3					1	3.4	1	3.3
5. Yes	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3							3	10.3	2	6.7
6. Non-Applicable	37	77.1	9	75.0	32	71.1	14	93.3	46	76.7	9	60.0	11	73.3	1	100.0	19	65.5	20	66.7
7. Blank because of ans. to a previous question	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0
TOTALS																				
26G.																				
1. No	26	54.2	7	58.3	24	53.3	9	60.0	33	55.0	7	46.7	5	33.3	1	100.0	11	37.9	12	40.0
2.	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3										
3. Undecided	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3										
4.	17	35.4	3	25.0	19	42.3	1	6.7	20	33.3	6	40.0	10	66.7			16	55.2	16	53.3
5. Yes	1	2.1	2	16.7	1	2.2	2	13.3	3	5.0										
6. Non-Applicable	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0
7. Blank																				
TOTALS																				
26M.																				
1. Never	10	20.8	2	16.7	9	20.0	3	20.0	12	20.0	2	13.3	5	33.3			7	24.1	7	23.3
2. Sometimes	10	20.8	1	8.3	7	15.6	3	20.0	11	18.3	4	26.7	1	6.7			5	17.2	5	16.7
3. Often	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7										
4. Undecided	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7										
5. Non-Applicable																				
6. Blank because of ans. to a previous question	25	52.1	7	58.3	23	51.1	9	60.0	32	53.3	7	46.7	5	33.3	1	100.0	11	37.9	12	40.0
7. Blank	1	2.1	2	16.7	3	6.7			3	5.0	2	13.3	1	6.7			3	10.3	3	10.0
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L								COMMUNITY N								GRAND TOTAL	
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL			
	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%
27.																						
1. No											2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7	2	2.2
2.																						
3. Undecided	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3											2	2.2
4.	3	6.3	3	25.0	4	8.9	2	13.3	6	10.0	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	8	8.9
5. Yes	42	87.5	9	75.0	37	82.4	13	86.7	50	83.3	12	80.0	13	86.7	1	100.0	25	86.2	26	86.7	76	84.4
6. Non-Applicable																						
7. Blank	1	2.1																				
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
28A.																						
1. No																						
2.																						
3. Uncertain																	1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
4.																						
5. Yes	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	28	96.6	29	96.7	89	98.9
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
28B.																						
1. Helps the child learn better with home & school working together	14	29.2	2	16.7	10	22.2	6	40.0	16	26.7	3	20.0	2	13.3			5	17.2	5	16.7	21	23.3
2. Helps parents & schools understand child by working with them	14	29.2	2	16.7	13	28.9	3	20.0	16	26.7	3	20.0	1	6.7			4	13.8	4	13.3	20	22.2
3. School or home cannot do it alone -- the child needs individual attention	3	6.3	1	8.3	4	8.9			4	6.7			2	13.3			2	6.9	2	6.7	6	6.7
4. Parental involvement because they care	3	6.3	1	8.3	1	2.2	3	20.0	4	6.7											4	4.4
5. So parents & school both know what's going on	6	12.5	2	16.7	7	15.6	1	6.7	8	13.3	1	6.7	3	20.0			4	13.8	4	13.3	12	13.3
6. Home influence & assistance help the child	1	2.1	2	16.7	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0	6	40.0	5	33.3	1	100.0	10	34.5	11	36.7	14	15.6
7. Have to work together	5	10.4	1	8.3	5	11.1	1	6.7	6	10.0											6	6.7
8. Non-Applicable	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	4	4.4
9 Blank			1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	3	3.3
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
29A.																						
1. No	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7	1	6.7	3	20.0			4	13.8	4	13.3	5	5.6
2.																						
3. Uncertain	1	2.1	1	8.3	1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											2	2.2
4.	1	2.1	1	8.3	1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											2	2.2
5. Yes	44	91.7	10	83.3	42	93.3	13	86.7	55	91.7	14	93.3	12	80.0	1	100.0	25	86.2	26	86.7	81	90.0
6. Non-Applicable																						
7. Blank	1	2.1																				
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
29B.																						
1. I'm informed by the program what the school expects of my child, also informed about innovations in teaching children	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3			2	13.3			2	6.9	2	6.7	4	4.4
2. P.T. explains to me	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3	7	46.7	3	20.0			10	34.5	10	33.3	12	13.3
3. School & P.E. explains to me	5	10.4	1	8.3	4	8.9	2	13.3	6	10.0	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	8	8.9
4. The program lets you know what level they're working towards, how they are doing in school, how to help them with the work they bring home	10	20.8	3	25.0	10	22.2	3	20.0	13	21.7	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	15	16.7
5. Yes, teachers assign homework, sends tasks home, & I help my child learn & understand better thru taking time with these exercises	3	6.3	2	16.7	4	8.9	1	6.7	5	8.3			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	6	6.7
6. Yes, it has shown my child what other children are doing	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											2	2.2
7. Yes, I treat my child as an individual at home as a result of the program	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											2	2.2
8. I already knew because I am a P.E. or teacher											3	20.0					3	10.3	3	10.0	3	3.3
9. Not challenged sufficiently											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
10. Can't explain	5	10.4	2	16.7	6	13.3	1	6.7	7	11.7											7	7.8
11. Non-Applicable	14	29.2	2	16.7	14	31.1	2	13.3	16	26.7	3	20.0	2	13.3	1	100.0	3	10.3	5	16.7	21	23.3
12. Blank	3	6.3	2	16.7	3	6.7	2	13.3	5	8.3			2	13.3			2	6.9	2	6.7	7	7.8
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L								COMMUNITY N								GRAND TOTAL	
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL			
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%
30A.																						
1. No	4	8.3	1	8.3	5	11.1			5	8.3	2	13.3	3	20.0	1	100.0	4	13.8	5	16.7	10	11.
2.																						
3. Undecided																						
4.	3	6.3	1	8.3	3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7							1	3.4	1	3.3	5	5.
5. Yes	41	85.4	10	83.3	37	82.2	13	86.7	50	83.3	13	86.7	12	80.0			22	75.9	22	73.3	72	80.
6. Non-Applicable																						
7. Blank																						
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.
30B.																						
1. Helps child at home &/or in the treatment of child	9	18.8			6	13.3	3	20.0	9	15.0	11	73.3	6	40.0			17	58.6	17	56.7	10	11.
2. Child learns at home & at school--a circular learning process	1	2.1	2	16.7	1	2.2	2	13.3	3	5.0											3	3.
3. Helps the child w/tasks, general education	13	27.1	4	33.3	15	33.3	2	13.3	17	28.3	1	6.7	2	13.3	1	100.0	2	6.9	3	10.0	20	22.
4. Has participated in school	6	12.5	3	25.0	5	11.1	4	26.7	9	15.0	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	10	11.
5. Yes, a great part of it	5	10.4	1	8.3	4	8.9	2	13.3	6	10.0											6	6.
6. No	3	6.3															2	6.9	2	6.7	5	5.
7. Non-Applicable	2	4.2	1	8.3	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0							2	6.9	2	6.7	5	5.
8. Blank	9	18.8	1	8.3	9	20.0	1	6.7	10	16.7	2	13.3	4	26.7			2	6.9	4	13.3	14	14.
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.
31A.																						
1. No	27	56.3	7	58.3	25	55.6	9	60.0	34	56.7	11	73.3	11	73.3	1	100.0	21	72.4	22	73.3	56	62.
2.																						
3. Undecided	4	8.3			4	8.9			4	6.7											4	4.
4.	1	2.1	2	16.7	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0											3	3.
5. Yes	16	33.3	3	25.0	14	31.1	5	33.3	19	31.7	4	26.7	4	26.7			8	27.6	8	26.7	27	30.
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.
31B.																						
1. Field trips, field trip volunteers	2	4.2	1	8.3	1	2.2	2	13.3	3	5.0											3	3.
2. Volunteer work of any type	3	6.3			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											2	2.
3. Parties, outings	3	6.3	1	8.3	3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7	2	13.3	2	13.3			4	13.8	4	13.3	7	7.
4. Spend one full day w/their own child, or have the mothers teach the class one full day	1	2.1	1	8.3	1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											4	4.
5. Participate in playground & at dinner	1	2.1					1	6.7	1	1.7											2	2.
6. Have the class come to the parent's home	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.
7. Parents should help prepare school menu	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.
8. Parents should play a part in the planning of the entire school system			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7											1	1.
9. Have school work up a packet & send it home to parent, have volunteer hours at home													1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.
10. Work with children whose parents aren't around											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.
11. Talk to the school officials											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.
12. Have classes for parents	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.
13. No suggestions.	7	14.6	1	8.3	7	15.6	1	6.7	8	13.3			3	20.0			3	10.3	3	10.0	11	12.
14. What's already done is enough	2	4.2	2	16.7	4	8.9			4	6.7	2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7	6	6.
15. Non-applicable	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3	2	13.3	1	6.7			3	10.3	3	10.0	5	5.
16. Blank because of ans. to a previous question	24	50.0	5	41.7	21	46.7	8	53.3	29	48.3	7	46.7	8	53.3	1	100.0	14	48.3	15	50.0	44	48.
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L										COMMUNITY N									
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		GRAND TOTAL	
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%
32A.																						
1. No	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
2.																						
3. Undecided																						
4.	2	4.2	1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7												
5. Yes	45	93.8	11	91.7	43	95.6	15	100.0	58	96.6	14	93.3	15	100.0	1	100.0	28	96.6	29	96.7	87	94.6
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
32B.																						
1. No, not at all	15	31.3	5	41.7	16	35.6	4	26.7	20	33.3	7	46.7	7	46.7			14	48.3	14	46.7	34	37.8
2. Yes, sometimes	23	47.9	3	25.0	23	51.1	7	46.7	30	50.0	5	33.3	4	26.7	1	100.0	9	31.0	9	30.0	39	43.3
3. Yes, often	5	10.4	2	16.7	3	6.7	2	13.3	5	8.3	2	13.3	4	26.7			6	20.7	6	20.0	12	13.3
4. Undecided																						
5. Non-Applicable																						
6. Blank											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
32C. No Responses																						
32D.																						
1. No, no value	2	4.2	1	8.3	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0	1	6.7			1	100.0			1	3.3	4	4.4
2.	2	4.2	2	16.7	2	4.4	2	13.3	4	6.7	3	20.0					3	10.3	3	10.0	7	7.8
3. Undecided	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3			1	6.7			2	6.9	3	10.0	5	5.6
4.	12	25.0	2	16.7	12	26.7	2	13.3	14	23.3			2	13.3			2	6.9	2	6.7	4	4.4
5. Yes, of tremendous value	18	37.5	2	16.7	15	33.3	5	33.3	20	33.3	3	20.0	5	33.3			9	27.6	8	26.7	28	31.1
6. Non-Applicable																						
7. Blank because of ans. to a previous question	14	29.2	5	41.7	15	33.3	4	26.7	19	31.7	7	46.7	6	40.0			13	44.8	13	43.3	32	35.6
8. Blank											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
32E.																						
1. She invited me to the meetings	7	14.6	3	25.0	6	13.3	4	26.7	10	16.7	1	6.7	2	13.3	1	100.0	2	6.9	3	10.0	13	14.4
2. She encouraged by stressing that the program needed parents' support and help	5	10.4	2	16.7	5	11.1	2	13.3	7	11.7											7	7.8
3. Informs through talking, letters, etc.	27	56.2	1	8.3	22	48.9	6	40.0	28	46.7	8	53.3	8	53.3			16	55.2	16	53.3	44	8.9
4. Encourage by offering transportation, etc.			1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
5. Encourages a great deal			2	16.7	2	4.4			2	3.3											2	2.2
6. No encouragement			2	16.7	1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3	3	20.0	1	6.7			4	13.8	4	13.3	6	6.7
7. P.E. didn't have to - parent went on own	6	12.5			5	11.1	1	6.7	6	10.0			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	7	7.8
8. P.E. didn't encourage because she understood family's circumstances concerning inability to attend meetings											2	13.3					2	6.9	2	6.7	2	2.2
9. P.E. didn't encourage because she feels meetings do not accomplish anything	3	6.3	1	8.3	3	6.7	1	6.7	4	6.7											4	4.4
10. Parent is a P.E. or PAC Chairman so doesn't need encouragement											1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	2	2.2
11. Non-Applicable																						
12. Blank													1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
32F.																						
1. No																						
2.																						
3. Undecided			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7	10	66.7	2	13.3			12	41.4	12	40.0	13	14.4
4.	2	4.2	2	16.7	4	8.9			4	6.7											4	4.4
5. Yes	32	66.7	6	50.0	28	62.2	11	73.3	39	65.0	5	33.3	11	73.3	1	100.0	13	44.8	12	40.0	52	57.8
6. Non-Applicable	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3											2	2.2
7. Blank because of ans. to a previous question			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7							2	6.9	2	6.7	3	3.3
8.	12	25.0	2	16.7	11	24.4	2	13.3	13	21.7			2	13.3							14	15.6
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L										COMMUNITY N										GRAND TOTAL	
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL			
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%
32G.																						
1. By being an officer	5	10.4	2	16.7	3	6.7	4	26.7	7	11.7			3	20.0			3	10.3	3	10.0	10	11.1
2. By voting for officers & issues	21	43.8	5	41.7	20	44.4	6	40.0	26	43.3	2	13.3	4	26.7			6	20.7	6	20.0	32	36.0
3. The program encouraged their suggestions, opinions	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	3	3.3
4. Their suggestions were definitely acted upon	5	10.4			4	8.9	1	6.7	5	8.3	1	6.7	2	13.3			3	10.3	3	10.0	8	9.0
5. They planned & created programs connected with PT including budgetary programs	1	2.1							1	1.7											1	1.1
6. Non-Applicable	8	16.7	2	16.7	6	13.3	4	26.7	10	16.7	10	66.7	4	26.7			14	48.3	14	46.7	24	27.0
7. Blank because of ans. to a previous questions	2	4.2	1	8.3	2	4.4			2	3.3					1	100.0	2	6.9	3	10.0	5	5.6
8. Blank	3	6.3	1	8.3	2	4.4	1	6.7	3	5.0	1	6.7	2	13.3			1	3.4	1	3.3	4	4.5
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
32H.																						
1. No	16	33.3	6	50.0	16	35.6	6	40.0	22	36.7	11	73.3	11	73.3	1	100.0	21	72.4	22	73.3	44	48.9
2.																					1	1.1
3. Undecided			1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
4.	2	4.2			2	4.4			2	3.3							1	3.4	1	3.3	3	3.3
5. Yes	30	62.5	5	41.7	26	57.8	9	60.0	35	58.3	4	26.7	4	26.7			7	24.1	8	26.7	43	47.8
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
32I.																						
1. PTA, Parent Organization, or community meeting	31	64.6	3	25.0	27	60.0	7	46.7	34	56.7			3	20.0			3	10.3	3	10.0	37	41.1
2. Bazaar Planning meeting			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7											1	1.1
3. Budget meeting	1	2.1					1	6.7	1	1.7											1	1.1
4.													1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
5. Career development & personnel selection meeting											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
6. Fellowship dinner											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
7. Open House																	1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.1
8. Mother's Club																						
9. Head Start meeting																						
10. Comprehensive services, task committee, personnel committee, mothers' club			1	8.3	1	2.2			1	1.7	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.2
11. Don't remember			1	8.3																	1	1.1
12. Non-Applicable	15	31.3	6	50.0	15	33.3	6	40.0	21	35.0	11	73.3	11	73.3	1	100.0	21	72.4	22	73.3	43	47.8
13. Blank because of ans. to a previous question	1	2.1																			1	1.1
14. Blank	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
TOTALS																						
33. GOOD COMMENTS																						
1. Program is outstanding in general	14	29.2	1	8.3	12	26.7	3	20.0	15	25.0			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	16	17.8
2. Program is good for parents and children	3	6.3			3	6.7			3	5.0											3	3.3
3. Program helps academically, financially, P.E. is good	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
4. Like the program			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7	1	6.7	1	6.7			2	6.9	2	6.7	3	3.3
5. Children benefit from the program, parents work hard	6	12.5	3	25.0	5	11.1	4	26.7	9	15.0	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	10	11.1
6. Good comments about school																						
7. Good comments about the child																						
8. Information about comprehensive services (counseling, dental, trips, etc.)	1	2.1	1	8.3	1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3	1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	3	3.3
9. Good comments about the P.E.			2	16.7			2	13.3	2	3.3											2	2.2
10. Good comments about parental involvement	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.1
11. Phase Out	2	4.2	1	8.3	2	4.4	2	13.3	3	5.0											3	3.3
12. Non-Applicable	18	37.5	3	25.0	19	42.2	2	13.3	21	35.0	12	80.0	13	86.7	1	100.0	24	82.8	25	83.3	46	51.1
13. Blank	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0
TOTALS																						

CATEGORIZED QUESTIONS	COMMUNITY L										COMMUNITY S										GRAND TOTAL	
	QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL		QUALIFIED		NON QUALIFIED		BLACK		WHITE		SUB-TOTAL			
	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	
13. BAD COMMENTS																						
1. Want P.T. in all rooms			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	2	3.3
2. Displeased in general											1	6.7					1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.7
3. Tasks too easy - PAC meetings not so good			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7											1	1.7
4. Should not separate middle from lower income families													1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.7
5. Bad comments concerning the child													1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	1	1.7
6. Bad comments about comprehensive services (dental, trips, counseling)	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.7
7. Bad comments about P.E.'s																						
8. Bad comments about personnel selection	1	2.1			1	2.2			1	1.7											1	1.7
9. Bad comments about informing parents			1	8.3			1	6.7	1	1.7			1	6.7			1	3.4	1	3.3	2	3.3
10. Non-Applicable	2	4.2			1	2.2	1	6.7	2	3.3											2	3.3
11. Blank	44	91.7	9	75.0	42	93.3	11	73.3	53	88.3	14	93.3	11	73.3	1	100.0	24	82.8	25	83.3	78	86.7
TOTALS	48	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	1	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	90	100.0

89207

APPENDIX D

Tables of Means, Standard Deviations and Gains
for Individual Communities by Grade Level
for the IFMF Results

00208

Center: K Grade K

Qualified Children
(n=37)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	61.65	48.19	37.97	59.78	43.97
	s	9.171	9.50	7.60	10.10	7.98
Postest	$\bar{x}$	60.92	49.32	37.89	59.00	45.59
	s	11.62	9.50	6.97	12.64	7.82
Gain		-0.73	1.13	-0.08	-0.78	1.62

Non Qualified Children
(n=15)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	62.80	50.47	39.47	60.33	44.40
	s	8.95	7.57	4.97	8.66	8.87
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.80	50.00	40.33	62.07	46.60
	s	7.62	7.92	5.74	7.78	6.60
Gain		1.00	-0.47	0.86	1.74	2.20

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00209

Center: L Grade K

Qualified Children
(n=21)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	53.52	46.71	37.04	52.19	41.23
	s	10.67	8.92	6.74	11.64	7.01
Postest	$\bar{x}$	68.85	55.76	43.23	66.42	50.57
	s	6.48	6.46	3.76	8.20	4.29
Gain		15.33	9.05	6.19	14.23	9.34

Non Qualified Children
(n=4)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	58.00	44.25	35.00	52.75	42.50
	s	2.16	3.59	3.65	4.99	5.97
Postest	$\bar{x}$	65.25	50.50	40.00	63.25	46.75
	s	8.26	9.98	8.28	9.94	8.65
Gain		7.25	6.25	5.00	10.50	4.25

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00210

Center: L Grade 1

Qualified Children
(n=11)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	62.54	52.18	40.00	58.90	49.09
	s	10.25	9.88	4.97	10.70	5.80
Postest	$\bar{x}$	68.36	55.18	42.54	66.72	52.36
	s	4.20	4.04	3.90	6.81	2.83
Gain		5.82	3.00	2.54	7.82	3.27

Non Qualified Children
(n=3)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	65.33	53.33	41.33	61.66	47.66
	s	2.51	4.16	3.21	5.13	3.78
Postest	$\bar{x}$	68.66	57.66	46.33	66.66	48.66
	s	6.50	3.05	1.52	7.63	6.50
Gain		3.33	4.33	5.00	5.00	1.00

1) General Adequacy
2) Peer
3) Teacher-School
4) Academic
5) Physical

09211

Center: L Grade 2

Qualified Children
(n=9)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	66.33	53.11	41.77	62.33	48.66
	s	6.08	6.60	4.08	6.83	6.28
Postest	$\bar{x}$	67.88	55.00	42.22	65.88	50.11
	s	6.15	4.76	3.41	4.04	4.19
Gain		1.55	1.99	0.45	3.55	1.45

Non Qualified Children
(n=1)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	68.0	57.0	44.0	69.0	48.0
	s	0	0	0	0	0
Postest	$\bar{x}$	69.0	55.0	45.0	72.0	49.0
	s	0	0	0	0	0
Gain		1.0	-2.0	1.0	3.0	1.0

1) General Adequacy
2) Peer
3) Teacher-School
4) Academic
5) Physical

09212

Qualified Children
(n=25)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	67.92	54.64	42.08	65.12	50.56
	s	7.22	6.77	5.51	9.41	5.13
Postest	$\bar{x}$	68.04	55.40	42.16	66.56	50.88
	s	6.76	4.52	4.06	7.89	4.89
Gain		0.12	0.76	0.08	1.44	0.32

Non Qualified Children
(n=4)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	66.25	50.75	38.25	65.00	51.25
	s	7.27	8.53	8.18	8.48	3.50
Postest	$\bar{x}$	65.25	54.50	41.25	62.50	49.75
	s	3.09	1.91	3.59	6.60	2.50
Gain		-1.00	3.75	3.00	-2.50	-1.50

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00213

Center: M Grade 1

Qualified Children
(n=18)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	58.38	49.00	37.72	55.55	45.05
	s	9.72	7.51	5.70	10.83	6.81
Postest	$\bar{x}$	58.83	48.72	37.50	58.05	44.88
	s	10.26	9.77	8.31	12.14	9.24
Gain		-0.55	-0.28	-0.22	2.50	-0.17

Non Qualified Children
(n=9)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	60.11	49.11	39.55	56.00	46.44
	s	7.23	9.08	6.93	7.79	7.60
Postest	$\bar{x}$	62.33	52.11	38.66	59.22	47.44
	s	4.55	3.78	2.29	4.71	4.53
Gain		2.22	3.00	-0.89	3.22	1.00

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00214

Center: N Grade K

Qualified Children
(n=32)

		Scale 1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	65.56	53.90	41.50	65.00	47.71
	s	13.66	11.31	7.90	14.05	10.19
Postest	$\bar{x}$	66.21	55.46	42.81	65.21	49.93
	s	5.93	6.63	4.36	8.47	5.92
Gain		2.65	1.56	1.31	0.21	2.22

Non Qualified Children
(n=24)

		Scale 1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	66.66	55.87	41.54	67.20	49.83
	s	10.12	7.64	6.71	8.88	8.24
Postest	$\bar{x}$	67.70	56.20	43.70	65.87	50.50
	s	5.82	5.18	3.35	7.26	4.98
Gain		1.04	0.33	2.16	-1.33	0.67

1) General Adequacy
2) Peer
3) Teacher-School
4) Academic
5) Physical

Center: N Grade 1

Qualified Children
(n=31)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	62.06	50.87	41.35	60.09	45.29
	s	11.39	10.52	5.63	11.66	9.20
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.35	52.54	39.96	59.54	46.12
	s	8.26	6.73	5.80	10.24	6.65
Gain		1.29	1.67	-1.39	-0.55	0.83

Non Qualified Children
(n=22)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	61.72	51.36	41.81	58.68	46.59
	s	9.67	7.85	4.92	11.57	7.50
Postest	$\bar{x}$	64.54	53.13	40.81	60.54	47.31
	s	7.12	5.51	4.62	9.99	5.48
Gain		2.82	1.77	-1.00	1.86	0.72

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00216

Center: N Grade 2

Qualified Children
(n=28)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	65.03	54.82	41.78	62.82	50.89
	s	8.53	5.74	4.53	8.46	4.58
Postest	$\bar{x}$	65.67	54.21	41.4[illegible]	61.89	48.78
	s	6.88	6.05	3.93	8.04	4.77
Gain		0.64	-0.61	-0.36	-0.93	-2.11

Non Qualified Children
(n=33)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	66.51	54.87	42.96	64.90	49.54
	s	5.84	4.70	3.45	7.05	4.85
Postest	$\bar{x}$	65.90	53.96	41.36	63.18	48.39
	s	4.64	5.64	4.25	6.53	4.19
Gain		-0.61	-0.91	-1.60	-1.72	-1.15

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00217

Qualified Children
(n=27)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	64.48	53.11	40.70	61.88	46.70
	s	7.33	5.97	6.13	8.36	5.80
Postest	$\bar{x}$	64.14	52.40	39.74	62.29	47.03
	s	6.84	6.10	5.90	6.93	5.65
Gain		-0.34	-0.71	-0.96	0.41	0.33

Non Qualified Children
(n=31)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	65.16	54.48	40.93	62.54	48.35
	s	5.88	5.15	4.67	6.72	5.18
Postest	$\bar{x}$	62.90	52.93	39.58	61.35	47.32
	s	7.38	5.67	5.39	7.41	5.16
Gain		-2.26	-1.55	-1.35	-1.19	-1.03

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00218

Center: O Grade K

Qualified Children
(n=156)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	62.11	51.55	39.26	60.54	45.82
	s	11.06	9.22	6.79	10.18	7.81
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.17	52.41	39.60	60.60	46.93
	s	10.47	8.75	6.50	10.55	7.42
Gain		1.06	0.86	0.34	0.06	1.11

Non Qualified Children
(n=44)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	61.00	49.84	38.72	58.09	44.59
	s	9.38	8.62	6.53	9.59	8.06
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.56	52.20	40.27	60.95	46.90
	s	8.58	7.41	5.97	9.39	6.51
Gain		2.56.	2.36	1.55	2.86	2.31

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00219

Center: 0 Grade 1

Qualified Children
(n=185)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	64.45	53.03	40.88	63.11	48.17
	s	9.26	7.16	5.70	9.59	6.30
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.80	53.00	40.98	62.50	47.91
	s	10.84	8.55	6.49	11.07	7.99
Gain		-0.65	-0.03	-0.10	-0.61	-0.26

Non Qualified Children
(n=34)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	58.05	48.32	36.76	56.08	42.91
	s	16.55	11.12	9.48	15.51	11.26
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.94	52.14	39.73	62.61	47.76
	s	10.16	7.67	6.85	8.59	6.80
Gain		5.89	3.82	2.97	6.53	4.85

1) General Adequacy
2) Peer
3) Teacher-School
4) Academic
5) Physical

00220

Qualified Children
(n=183)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	65.53	53.68	41.98	64.63	49.00
	s	7.75	7.07	5.49	8.56	5.51
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.30	51.66	40.85	61.61	48.42
	s	8.21	7.52	5.07	8.89	5.41
Gain		-2.23	-2.02	-1.13	-3.02	-0.58

Non Qualified Children
(n=60)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	65.41	53.56	41.90	63.80	48.60
	s	8.44	6.26	5.18	8.83	5.01
Postest	$\bar{x}$	64.85	52.70	41.38	62.60	48.88
	s	7.51	5.77	4.75	8.49	3.93
Gain		-0.56	-0.86	-0.52	-1.20	0.28

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00221

Center: 0 Grade 3

Qualified Children
(n=175)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	63.66	52.42	40.62	62.24	48.53
	s	7.42	5.62	4.92	7.76	4.86
Postest	$\bar{x}$	61.09	50.34	38.90	60.06	46.45
	s	10.42	8.37	6.87	10.30	8.17
Gain		-2.57	-2.08	-1.72	-2.18	-2.08

Non Qualified Children
(n=40)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	65.05	53.15	42.05	62.90	49.15
	s	6.76	5.13	3.52	7.26	4.00
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.75	52.00	41.15	61.80	47.52
	s	7.71	6.08	4.37	8.41	5.32
Gain		-1.30	-1.15	-0.90	-1.10	-1.63

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00222

Center: P Grade 1

Qualified Children
(n=18)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	64.22	55.22	42.72	59.72	49.50
	s	7.03	4.85	3.48	8.42	5.32
Postest	$\bar{x}$	65.50	53.94	42.72	61.89	47.78
	s	7.85	5.98	3.75	10.60	5.80
Gain		1.28	-1.28	0.0	2.17	-1.72

Non Qualified Children
(n=16)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	65.00	57.38	41.75	61.00	50.56
	s	7.54	6.65	6.89	6.96	5.67
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.00	51.94	39.69	60.13	47.25
	s	7.35	5.89	5.06	8.91	4.96
Gain		-2.00	-5.44	-2.06	-0.87	-3.31

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00223

Center: P Grade 2

Qualified Children
(n=27)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	63.41	52.33	40.56	60.70	47.44
	s	7.19	5.92	3.68	7.67	5.14
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.52	51.93	40.81	59.96	47.59
	s	8.15	7.07	4.33	9.65	5.88
Gain		0.11	-0.40	0.25	-0.74	0.15

Non Qualified Children
(n=16)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	65.44	53.94	42.00	62.31	49.13
	s	5.54	4.73	3.23	7.25	4.38
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.25	53.25	40.00	58.50	47.38
	s	5.56	4.30	4.50	7.92	4.83
Gain		-2.19	-0.69	-2.00	-3.81	-1.75

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00224

Qualified Children
(n=26)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	63.04	52.00	40.58	59.23	46.62
	s	6.86	5.31	6.11	7.93	4.25
Postest	$\bar{x}$	60.50	50.92	37.50	57.92	45.77
	s	8.32	4.96	5.63	8.29	5.15
Gain		-2.54	-1.08	-3.08	-1.31	-0.85

Non Qualified Children
(n=22)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	63.09	52.73	39.86	60.77	46.95
	s	8.12	6.13	5.96	8.04	5.83
Postest	$\bar{x}$	60.14	49.95	37.32	58.41	44.32
	s	7.84	6.34	5.26	7.24	5.05
Gain		-2.95	-2.78	-2.54	-2.36	-2.63

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical
2) Peer 4) Academic

Center: Q Grade K

Qualified Children
(n=31)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	62.22	53.35	39.58	59.06	46.00
	s	9.07	6.98	5.80	10.62	7.60
Postest	$\bar{x}$	59.09	49.48	36.16	58.00	44.90
	s	10.59	8.28	7.52	10.48	8.48
Gain		-3.13	-3.87	-3.42	-1.06	-1.10

Non Qualified Children

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$					
	s					
Postest	$\bar{x}$					
	s					
Gain						

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00230

Center: R Grade K

Qualified Children

(n=45)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	57.47	48.91	37.40	54.58	43.22
	s	12.44	9.56	7.53	12.85	8.57
Postest	$\bar{x}$	57.31	46.76	36.51	55.62	43.02
	s	12.95	10.25	7.70	11.72	8.52
Gain		-0.16	-2.15	-0.89	1.04	-0.20

Non Qualified Children

(n=19)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	56.63	44.37	35.63	52.16	42.68
	s	14.37	11.82	7.44	13.65	11.17
Postest	$\bar{x}$	56.68	47.26	37.74	55.42	44.63
	s	11.89	10.89	8.47	13.49	7.93
Gain		0.05	2.89	2.11	3.26	1.95

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00227

Center: R Grade 1

Qualified Children
(n=11)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	56.55	47.73	37.09	56.64	40.55
	s	12.25	9.68	6.16	10.29	10.08
Postest	$\bar{x}$	67.27	55.73	43.00	64.73	49.09
	s	5.61	4.17	3.29	4.50	4.32
Gain		10.72	8.00	5.91	8.09	8.54

Non Qualified Children
(n=14)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	64.36	52.00	41.50	60.07	46.21
	s	10.81	6.93	6.26	12.52	6.65
Postest	$\bar{x}$	65.57	53.36	40.86	59.57	48.71
	s	6.56	4.33	5.05	8.28	4.56
Gain		1.21	1.36	-0.64	-0.50	2.50

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00328

Center: R Grade 2

Qualified Children
(n=24)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	65.04	54.00	41.71	63.04	49.29
	s	7.89	6.33	4.29	7.42	5.13
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.38	51.54	39.04	62.71	48.38
	s	5.98	5.73	6.36	6.88	3.77
Gain		-1.66	-2.46	-2.67	-0.33	-0.91

Non Qualified Children
(n=12)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	61.75	51.17	40.25	60.92	44.67
	s	8.70	5.25	4.54	9.86	6.93
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.50	51.92	38.33	61.33	49.67
	s	3.18	2.78	5.60	4.48	2.27
Gain		1.75	0.75	-1.92	0.41	5.00

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00229

Center: R Grade 3

Qualified Children
(n=36)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	62.94	51.83	40.67	60.47	48.19
	s	6.93	5.81	4.65	7.59	5.67
Postest	$\bar{x}$	63.08	50.86	39.17	61.28	47.50
	s	5.67	5.61	5.44	5.69	4.84
Gain		0.14	-0.97	-1.50	0.81	-0.69

Non Qualified Children
(n=18)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	62.28	52.11	40.33	59.83	47.67
	s	7.37	5.72	3.63	8.05	4.79
Postest	$\bar{x}$	64.22	52.00	39.83	61.94	47.72
	s	7.03	6.78	6.15	7.18	5.39
Gain		1.94	-0.11	-0.50	2.11	0.05

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

00230

Qualified Children
(n=177)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	57.81	47.18	37.56	56.05	42.87
	s	12.26	10.35	8.01	12.69	8.90
Postest	$\bar{x}$	61.31	49.31	39.69	59.17	45.23
	s	10.62	8.89	6.74	11.30	8.42
Gain		3.50	2.13	2.13	3.12	2.36

Non Qualified Children
(n=47)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	63.59	52.00	40.63	61.17	46.63
	s	10.93	9.55	6.60	11.61	8.32
Postest	$\bar{x}$	64.25	53.48	41.89	63.59	48.74
	s	8.93	7.63	4.35	9.92	6.08
Gain		0.66	1.48	1.26	2.42	2.11

1) General Adequacy
2) Peer
3) Teacher-School
4) Academic
5) Physical

Qualified Children
(n=161)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	64.32	52.24	41.04	63.06	48.12
	s	9.83	8.04	6.14	10.61	6.98
Postest	$\bar{x}$	64.63	52.41	41.80	63.65	47.99
	s	8.18	7.19	4.51	9.19	6.06
Gain		0.31	0.17	0.76	0.59	-0.13

Non Qualified Children
(n=45)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	66.22	53.04	42.06	65.66	47.86
	s	7.23	7.84	4.77	8.04	7.75
Postest	$\bar{x}$	66.86	55.15	42.15	65.08	50.33
	s	6.75	5.23	5.24	7.83	4.19
Gain		0.64	2.11	0.09	-0.58	2.47

1) General Adequacy
2) Peer
3) Teacher-School
4) Academic
5) Physical

Center: S Grade 3

Qualified Children
(n=140)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	64.69	53.20	41.77	64.06	48.32
	s	6.92	5.90	4.79	7.17	4.94
Postest	$\bar{x}$	64.02	52.72	41.06	63.17	48.67
	s	7.51	5.99	4.90	7.51	4.86
Gain		-0.67	-0.48	-0.71	-0.89	0.35

Non Qualified Children
(n=75)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	63.32	53.20	41.93	64.09	48.02
	s	7.17	5.58	4.04	7.40	5.87
Postest	$\bar{x}$	65.04	53.64	41.77	63.32	48.64
	s	6.83	5.48	4.07	7.16	4.98
Gain		1.72	0.44	-0.16	-0.77	0.62

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

Center: T Grade 1

Qualified Children
(n=17)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	59.82	46.53	38.00	56.00	43.47
	s	10.38	9.70	6.49	10.48	7.95
Postest	$\bar{x}$	64.47	51.11	39.41	60.76	47.06
	s	8.91	9.00	8.85	8.64	7.58
Gain		4.65	4.58	1.41	4.76	3.59

Non Qualified Children
(n=17)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	64.53	55.41	41.82	62.82	48.76
	s	8.47	5.20	4.11	9.24	4.23
Postest	$\bar{x}$	66.23	55.76	42.24	64.65	50.70
	s	7.14	5.04	4.76	6.71	4.10
Gain		1.70	0.35	0.42	1.83	1.94

1) General Adequacy
2) Peer
3) Teacher-School
4) Academic
5) Physical

Qualified Children
(n=36)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	65.17	52.28	40.58	62.92	48.28
	s	5.02	5.39	4.22	6.30	4.19
Postest	$\bar{x}$	65.42	53.58	41.22	64.19	49.47
	s	6.04	5.29	4.03	6.58	3.38
Gain		0.25	1.30	0.64	1.27	1.19

Non Qualified Children
(n=26)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	65.69	53.65	40.07	63.84	49.04
	s	7.39	6.25	6.06	8.14	5.76
Postest	$\bar{x}$	68.23	55.77	41.88	66.08	50.04
	s	5.89	5.36	3.97	5.90	4.51
Gain		2.54	2.12	1.81	2.24	1.00

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

Center: T Grade 3

Qualified Children
(n=20)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	59.05	50.25	38.25	56.80	45.30
	s	6.98	5.05	4.51	7.44	4.09
Postest	$\bar{x}$	64.40	52.70	40.45	61.50	48.85
	s	6.79	5.73	3.73	8.19	3.94
Gain		5.35	2.45	2.20	4.70	3.55

Non Qualified Children
(n=22)

Scale

		1	2	3	4	5
Pretest	$\bar{x}$	65.18	52.64	39.91	62.54	47.68
	s	5.92	5.37	4.59	5.70	4.06
Postest	$\bar{x}$	65.13	52.77	39.95	63.04	49.00
	s	7.12	5.23	5.66	6.52	2.88
Gain		-0.05	0.13	0.04	0.50	1.32

1) General Adequacy 3) Teacher-School 5) Physical

2) Peer 4) Academic

APPENDIX E

Center L

1973-74 Average Use of a Home Learning Task by Classroom

CLASS	TOTAL TASKS	DIFFERENT TASKS	TOTAL TASKS/ DIFFERENT TASKS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CLASSROOM
1	502	30	16.73	27
2	325	26	12.50	27
3	181	34	5.32	25
4	659	43	15.33	32
5	557	32	17.41	25
6	378	29	13.03	27
7	226	21	10.76	28
8	602	41	14.68	26
9	594	45	13.20	24
10	538	34	15.82	28
11	340	29	11.72	27
12	493	37	13.32	31
13	755	32	23.59	31
14	439	30	14.63	31
15	502	30	16.73	30
16	631	30	21.03	30
17	226	23	9.83	28
18	203	20	10.15	29
19	376	30	12.53	30
20	274	24	11.42	30
21	520	30	17.33	29
22	169	17	9.94	28
23	563	36	15.64	26
24	426	28	15.21	25
25	278	26	10.69	24
26	550	33	16.67	28
27	678	33	20.55	28
28	629	33	19.06	32
29	534	37	14.43	26
30	462	37	12.49	24
31	398	28	14.21	26

Center K

1973-74 Average Use of a Home Learning Task by Classroom

CLASS	TOTAL TASKS	DIFFERENT TASKS	TOTAL TASKS/ DIFFERENT TASKS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CLASSROOM
1	708	78	9.08	34
2	463	94	4.93	30
3	601	95	6.33	45
4	645	84	7.68	36
5	557	59	9.44	31
6	656	131	5.01	35
7	692	86	8.05	37
8	755	75	10.07	32
9	786	73	10.77	33
10	367	107	3.43	13
11	678	106	6.40	37
12	622	60	10.37	37
13	611	78	7.83	34
14	586	52	11.27	28
15	680	119	5.71	36
16	832	130	6.40	31
17	735	81	9.07	30
18	590	94	6.28	33
19	776	96	8.08	35
20	923	72	12.82	40
21	753	80	9.41	38
22	875	57	15.35	35
23	608	90	6.76	34
24	665	70	9.50	36
25	91	44	2.07	06
26	95	31	3.06	09
27	142	51	2.78	07
28	684	76	9.00	29
29	633	68	9.31	36
30	470	82	5.73	39
31	561	82	6.84	32
32	503	97	5.19	31
33	560	111	5.05	33
34	565	90	6.28	32
35	612	68	9.00	35
36	839	81	10.36	32
37	548	58	9.45	26

Center M

1973-74 Average Use of a Home Learning Task by Classroom

CLASS	TOTAL TASKS	DIFFERENT TASKS	TOTAL TASKS/ DIFFERENT TASKS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CLASSROOM
1	799	89	8.98	31
2	860	70	12.29	31
3	870	51	17.06	30
4	570	67	8.51	28
5	719	55	13.07	29
6	674	49	13.76	29
7	587	54	10.87	28
8	568	49	11.59	24
9	566	31	18.26	25
10	508	38	13.37	24
11	574	40	14.35	24
12	378	32	11.81	24
13	602	37	16.27	30
14	680	39	17.44	29
15	901	46	19.59	29
16	482	52	9.27	28
17	460	35	13.14	29
18	841	55	15.29	29
19	493	45	10.96	28
20	708	48	14.75	31
21	559	30	18.63	28
22	605	44	13.75	28

Center N

1973-74 Average Use of a Home Learning Task by Classroom

CLASS	TOTAL TASKS	DIFFERENT TASKS	TOTAL TASKS/ DIFFERENT TASKS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CLASSROOM
1	299	47	6.36	25
2	261	47	5.55	30
3	416	39	10.67	25
4	434	45	9.64	31
5	385	40	9.63	29
6	351	44	7.98	27
7	449	28	16.04	28
8	290	37	7.84	28
9	340	31	10.97	22
10	421	34	12.38	24
11	269	24	11.21	23
12	247	39	6.33	

99341

Center O

1973-74 Average Use of a Home Learning Task by Classroom

CLASS	TOTAL TASKS	DIFFERENT TASKS	TOTAL TASKS/ DIFFERENT TASKS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CLASSROOM
1	596	72	8.28	28
2	945	93	10.16	35
3	828	56	14.79	36
4	694	48	14.46	30
5	617	49	12.59	30
6	633	41	15.44	40
7	693	83	8.35	30
8	727	35	20.77	35
9	716	48	14.92	29
10	793	38	20.87	37
11	492	30	16.40	32
12	839	39	21.51	30
13	512	28	18.29	24
14	681	40	17.02	27
15	692	58	11.93	35
16	757	80	9.46	32
17	524	85	6.16	26
18	632	59	10.71	25
19	607	73	8.32	24
20	569	89	6.39	23
21	405	50	8.10	25
22	360	56	6.43	25
23	315	34	9.26	30
24	554	68	8.15	29
25	759	73	10.40	32
26	498	47	10.60	34
27	433	62	6.98	24
28	670	61	10.98	27
29	426	61	6.98	25
30	435	69	6.30	25
31	458	64	7.16	30
32	557	102	5.46	32
33	626	50	12.52	33
34	511	46	11.11	32
35	728	49	14.86	33
36	776	48	16.17	33
37	585	61	9.59	36
38	625	88	7.10	33
39	464	54	8.59	34

Center P

1973-74 Average Use of a Home Learning Task by Classroom

CLASS	TOTAL TASKS	DIFFERENT TASKS	TOTAL TASKS/ DIFFERENT TASKS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CLASSROOM
1	405	57	7.11	26
2	611	73	8.37	26
3	558	98	5.69	23
4	389	73	5.33	21
5	378	82	4.61	20
6	513	99	5.18	18
7	460	80	5.75	25
8	516	126	4.10	26
9	554	48	11.54	28
10	288	59	4.88	26
11	464	62	7.48	22
12	378	65	5.82	25
13	468	43	10.88	27
14	673	118	5.70	34
15	662	95	6.97	35
16	600	93	6.45	36
17	498	97	5.13	27
18	393	59	6.66	31
19	379	46	8.24	30

09243

Center Q

1973-74 Average Use of a Home Learning Task by Classroom

CLASS	TOTAL TASKS	DIFFERENT TASKS	TOTAL TASKS/ DIFFERENT TASKS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CLASSROOM
1	433	56	7.73	24
2	560	53	10.57	25
3	647	32	20.22	25
4	483	46	10.50	24
5	634	27	23.48	37
6	606	60	10.10	23
7	665	48	13.85	26
8	578	46	12.57	23
9	476	35	13.60	34
10	588	38	15.47	36
11	627	41	15.29	31
12	599	43	13.93	31
13	468	27	17.33	34
14	230	23	10.00	14
15	329	46	7.15	28
16	295	35	8.43	28
17	114	28	4.07	44
18	201	35	5.74	46
19	228	19	12.00	44
20	78	30	2.60	14

Center R

1973-74 Average Use of a Home Learning Task by Classroom

CLASS	TOTAL TASKS	DIFFERENT TASKS	TOTAL TASKS/ DIFFERENT TASKS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CLASSROOM
1	858	55	15.60	30
2	719	58	12.40	41
3	697	63	11.06	38
4	451	29	15.55	29
5	201	40	5.02	24
6	766	48	15.96	33
7	486	33	14.73	29
8	738	42	17.57	29
9	402	41	9.80	32
10	350	41	8.54	31
11	375	50	7.50	29
12	414	43	9.63	31
13	467	58	8.05	30
14	375	29	12.93	23
15	860	49	17.55	31
16	423	35	12.09	29
17	607	29	20.93	33
18	182	26	7.00	29
19	487	38	12.82	27
20	154	30	5.13	30
21	659	46	14.33	30
22	656	47	13.96	27
23	256	92	2.78	25
24	510	48	10.63	33
25	256	40	6.40	32
26	604	62	9.74	40
27	655	35	18.71	26
28	342	39	8.77	28
29	825	59	13.98	27
30	695	56	12.41	25
31	279	42	6.64	29
32	536	50	10.72	29
33	702	48	14.63	30
34	328	29	11.31	31
35	587	54	10.87	26
36	400	36	11.11	31
37	577	87	6.63	24
38	346	50	6.92	25

Center S

1973-74 Average Use of a Home Learning Task by Classroom

CLASS	TOTAL TASKS	DIFFERENT TASKS	TOTAL TASKS/ DIFFERENT TASKS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CLASSROOM
1	539	97	5.56	28
2	661	118	5.60	31
3	533	131	4.07	34
4	590	108	5.46	33
5	552	88	6.27	33
6	853	82	10.40	32
7	843	75	11.24	32
8	773	131	5.90	32
9	802	118	6.80	32
10	748	91	8.22	30
11	823	85	9.68	33
12	618	95	6.51	30
13	621	85	7.31	31
14	611	84	7.27	38
15	675	158	4.27	38
16	632	138	4.58	37
17	562	117	4.80	40
18	554	93	5.96	33
19	633	67	9.45	33
20	564	111	5.08	31
21	529	124	4.27	33
22	743	69	10.77	37
23	642	107	6.00	42
24	605	86	7.03	34
25	656	131	5.01	37
26	605	138	4.38	33
27	69	49	1.41	08

00246

Center T

1973-74 Average Use of a Home Learning Task by Classroom

CLASS	TOTAL TASKS	DIFFERENT TASKS	TOTAL TASKS/ DIFFERENT TASKS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CLASSROOM
1	274	57	4.81	25
2	446	65	6.86	20
3	328	64	5.13	18
4	391	70	5.59	19
5	461	60	7.68	29
6	565	45	12.56	30
7	516	73	7.07	33
8	646	98	6.59	37
9	731	44	16.61	35
10	689	47	14.66	39
11	247	39	6.33	32
12	520	51	10.20	35
13	444	54	8.22	33
14	519	66	7.86	35
15	398	46	8.65	33
16	616	44	14.00	36
17	439	43	10.21	29
18	283	33	8.58	25
19	355	37	9.59	27
20	479	55	8.71	35
21	448	56	8.00	32
22	537	44	12.20	39
23	688	40	17.20	33
24	501	49	10.22	36
25	623	66	9.44	34
26	626	61	10.26	35
27	571	38	15.03	35
28	557	58	9.60	37
29	846	39	21.69	34
30	577	52	11.10	40
31	487	52	9.37	39
32	844	48	17.58	39
33	684	66	10.36	38
34	527	39	13.51	39
35	562	61	9.21	36
36	440	39	11.28	25

Center U

1973-74 Average Use of a Home
Learning Task by Classroom

CLASS	TOTAL TASKS	DIFFERENT TASKS	TOTAL TASKS/ DIFFERENT TASKS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CLASSROOM
1	630	56	11.25	41
2	360	64	5.63	30
3	481	63	7.63	24
4	449	46	9.76	25
5	270	39	6.92	17
6	324	40	8.10	19

APPENDIX F

THESE INSTRUCTIONS ARE TO BE READ TO THE PARENT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SESSION -- AFTER THE VIDEOTAPE MACHINE HAS BEEN TURNED ON

PECE Instructions

Parent-Child Session

As part of a national educational project we are looking at how parents teach or work with their children. Your community has been selected to participate in this project.

We have selected a book and are asking different parents to read this book with their child. There is no right way or wrong way to read this book with your child, so read it with him any way you please. We are only interested in seeing how you do read with him.

Here is a sheet giving suggestions you might use while reading with your child. You do not have to use these suggestions if you do not want to. You may also do things not listed on the sheet if you wish to. You should read the book with your child any way you want to.

Do you have any questions?

D.T.B.s
1,2,3,4,5,6 &7

Whistle for Willie

Why? This activity will help your child develop his skills of listening, speaking, and observing.

What? A story book.

How?

1. Read the book with your child stopping often to point at and talk about different things in the pictures. Get your child to tell you as many things as he can about the pictures.

2. Talk with your child about things in the book that he is familiar with, has done himself, also likes, etc. Encourage him to talk about things or parts in the book that remind him about something he has, has done, or would like to do.

3. After you have read the book, ask your child to tell you about it.

00251

APPENDIX G

APPENDIX G
AGENDA

The Florida Parent Education Program
Summer Workshop
Flagler Inn
Gainesville, Florida 32611

July 16-18, 1973

Group A - Superintendents, School Board Members, Resource Persons

Group B - Project Coordinator, PAC Chairman, Evaluation Specialist

Monday - July 16

8:30 - 9:00	Registration		
9:00 - 10:00	Welcome, Orientation to Workshop	Ira J. Gordon	Convention C 2nd Floor
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee Break		
10:30 - 12:00	Group A - Nature and purpose of Florida Model -- cost analysis of a home visit program.	W. F. Breivogel Patricia Olmsted W. B. Ware	Convention B 2nd Floor
	Group B - PAC issues	G. E. Greenwood Hattie Bessent James Bracey	Convention C 2nd Floor
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch		
1:30 - 4:30	"Research" evidence on the effectiveness of the Florida Model and presentations by resource people on community impact.	W. B. Ware W. F. Breivogel G. E. Greenwood Patricia Olmsted	Convention C 2nd Floor
8:30 a.m.-5:30 p.m.	The Board Room will be available for conferences.		2nd Floor

Tuesday, July 17

9:00 - 10:00	Discussion of assistance that the Institute can render to help local communities continue their program. Discussion of kinds of data that need to be collected to help sell the program in the community.	G. E. Greenwood W. B. Ware Liaison Officers	Convention C 2nd Floor
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee Break		

Tuesday, July 17 (contd.)			Rooms for small group meetings
10:30 - 11:30	Community-by-community planning sessions concerned with continuing or expanding the program	G.E. Greenwood W.B. Ware Liaison Officers	Captain's Table 1st Floor (1 Gold Key 1st Floor (2 Convention B 2nd Floor (3 Convention C 2nd Floor (2 Convention D 2nd Floor (1
11:30 - 12:00	Dr. Gordon's farewell speech to superintendents and school board members who will leave in the afternoon	Ira J. Gordon	Convention C 2nd Floor
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch		
1:30 - 2:30	Discussion of Letters of Agreement and new evaluation forms.	W.B. Ware W.F. Breivogel G.E. Greenwood Patricia Olmsted	Convention C 2nd Floor
2:30 - 3:30	Meetings with liaison officers and general consultants	Liaison Officers	Same as the 10:30 a.m. July 17 meetings
8:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m.	The Board Room will be equipped for the showing of slides and movies brought from the communities.		2nd Floor
Wednesday, July 18			
9:00 - 10:00	Evaluation - Feedback on new PEWR format - maximizing data feedback for public relations purposes.	Patricia Olmsted W.B. Ware W.F. Breivogel G.E. Greenwood Steve Sledjeski	Convention C 2nd Floor
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee Break		
10:30 - 11:30	PAC plans for next year.	James Bracey Hattie Bessent	Convention C 2nd Floor
11:30 - 12:00	Closing remarks.	Ira J. Gordon	Convention C 2nd Floor
8:30 a.m.-5:30 p.m.	The Board Room will be available for conferences		2nd Floor

APPENDIX G

Summer Workshop

Chattanooga, Tennessee

July 16, 17, 18, 1973
66 Total
19 left Tuesday noon

Jack Connor - Federal Programs
Nancy Garrett - PAC Chairman
Gene Horton - Director
Eunice Rooks - Program Assistant
John Schaerer - Evaluator

Houston, Texas

Billie Bessett - Psychologist
Dr. Jerry Brown - Psychologist
Dean Damon - Assistant Superintendent (non-public)
Doris Holley - PAC Chairman
Frank James - Evaluator
Joe Liggins - Assistant Superintendent
G.T. Oser - Trustee
Joe Washington - Vice PAC Chairman
Jerlean Webster - Director

Jacksonville, Florida

Kate Graves - Psychologist
Mary Hampton - Parent
Julie Lamberts - Evaluator
Josie Messer - Director
Bob Cronin - Federal Programs
John Wagner - Program Planning

Jonesboro, Arkansas

R.L. Bradbury - Assistant Superintendent
Nina Coleman - Vice PAC Chairman
Dr. B.C. DeSpain - Superintendent
Ginny Griffin - School Board Member
Betty Scott - Resource Person
Nettie Whitehead - Director

Lawrenceburg, Indiana

C. Cizek - Principal
Helen Conrad - President School Board
Frances Earp - Title I
Stephen Gabbard - Superintendent
Margaret Huebner - PAC Chairman
Jake Sehitza - Director
Louise Young - Federal Programs Director

University of Florida

James Bracey

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Doris Cohen - PAC Chairman
June Hairtston - Assistant Superintendent District #3
Floyda Marcus - Director
Tom McNamara - Evaluator
Sallye Puryear - Resource Person
Leontine Scott - Director Federal Programs
Arthur Thomas - Board Member

Richmond, Virginia

Virgie Binford - Director
Pat Brown - PAC Chairman
Pat Gordon - Parent
Linda Fry - Parent
Dr. Ray Garguilo - Evaluator
W.T. Griffin - Mini-PAC Chairman
Bill Hicks - Parent
Miles Jones - Chairman School Board
Dan Nix - Assistant Director of Federal Programs
Dr. Pinckney - Director of Elementary Education

Tampa, Florida

Gail Loori - Parent
Altamease Nickson - Resource Person
Clara Nuccio - Director
Ruth Reynolds - Curriculum-FT Staff
Sharon Tallent - PAC Chairman
Vilma Vega - Curriculum Coordinator - FT Staff

APPENDIX G

Winnsboro, South Carolina

David Belton - Resource Person
Larry Hoyle - Superintendent School Board
Carole Kinder - Evaluator
Bill Lyles - Director
Matthew Seibles - School Board Members
Thomas Murphy - PAC Chairman

Yakima, Washington

Jack Frisk - Superintendent
Rosemary Rief - Resource Person
William Simmons - School Board Member
Anna Uebelacker - Director

APPENDIX H

09258

APPENDIX H

AGENDA

The Florida Parent Education Program
Winter Workshop
Flager Inn
Gainesville, Florida 32611

November 14-15, 1973

Wednesday, November 14

8:30 - 9:00	Registration		Mezzanine
9:00 - 10:00	"Where are we now and where are we going?"	Rose Koury Pat Olmsted	Conference A
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee break		
10:30 - 12:00	Proposal writing presentation	Rose Koury Pat Olmsted	Conference A
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch		
1:30 - 2:30	PAC action, local and national		Conference A
2:30 - 3:30	Small groups		
	A. Proposal writing continued		Conference A
	B. PAC action continued		Conference B

Thursday, November 15

9:00 - 10:00	Revision of Sponsor Objectives		Conference A
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee break		
10:30 - 12:00	Sharing of local funding plans for entering grade and work plans for consulting, 1974-75		Conference A
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch		
1:30 - 2:30	Status of 1973-74 Data Collection		Conference A
2:30 - 3:30	Wrap-up		Conference A

Conference Room B has been reserved for small groups on Wednesday; the Board Room for small groups on Thursday.

APPENDIX H

Winter Workshop
November 14-15, 1973.

Chattanooga, Tennessee

Gene Horton - Project Coordinator
Hattie Smith - PAC Chairman
Eunice Rooks - Program Assistant

Houston, Texas

Jerlean A. Webster - Project Coordinator
Imogene Elliott - Teacher Assistant
Serelia Sanford - Teacher Assistant
Delores Clark - Social worker
Doris Holley - PAC Chairman
Sister M. Devota - Principal

Jacksonville, Florida

Josie Messer - Project Coordinator
Mary Hampton - Parent Educator - Parent
Lorraine Washington - Parent Educator - Parent
Ellen Fisher - Project Developer
Alice Williams - PAC Chairman
Casandra Robinson - Education Chairman
Sarah Crews - Parent
Mary Clark - Early Childhood Specialist
Doris Hallman - Task Specialist
Rose Glover - Task Specialist
Jeanette Johnson - LPN
Joyce Smith - Social worker
Margaret Stanley - Nurse

Jonesboro, Arkansas

Nettie Whitehead - Project Coordinator
Bob Yopp - CAP Director
Leon Lee - Elementary Superintendent
Miron Williams - Assistant Superintendent Finance
Barbara Pemberton - PAC Chairman

Lac Du Flambeau

Janet Jubert

APPENDIX H

Winter Workshop
November 14-15, 1973

Lawrenceburg, Indiana

J. C. Senitza - Project Coordinator
Clint Cizek - Principal - Parent
Louis Young - Coordinator
Francis Earp - Tech Assistant
Waneatah Ketrow - Program Assistant
Kay Turner - PAC Vice Chairman

Richmond, Virginia

Virgie Binford - Project Coordinator
Linda Fry - Community Volunteer
Patrick Brown - PAC Chairman
Estelle Johnson - Parent Educator - Parent
Pat Gordon - Mini PAC Chairman
Martha Tates - Parent
Timothy Omartha - Parent
Sally Kelly - Research
Warren Griffin - Parent
W. Hicks - Parent
Dan Nix - Administrator of Federal Program

Tampa, Florida

Clara Nuccio - Project Coordinator
Carol Pitts - PAC Chairman
Betty Berry - Mini PAC Chairman
Joyce Hierst - Co-Chairman Mini PAC
Jean Shirley - Mini PAC Secretary
Joe Yglesias - Director
Lorreta Vacanti - H.L.A. Specialist
Janet Roehm - Language Arts Specialist
Lois Phillips - Social worker
Marian Walters - Mini PAC Chairman
Wilma Dooley - Mini PAC Co-Secretary
Sarah Mosley - Secretary
Mary Brown - Secretary
Vilma Vega - Curriculum
Altamease Nickson - Coordinator worker

00361

APPENDIX H

Winter Workshop
November 14-15, 1973

Winnsboro, South Carolina

Bill Lyles - Project Coordinator
Carole Kinder - Psychologist and project evaluator

Yakima, Washington

Anna Uebelacker - Project Coordinator
Gloria Moore - PAC Chairman
Dan Organ - Evaluator

U of F

James Bracey - PAC Consultant

Rose Koury - U.S. Office of Education - Project Officer

Ann Marie Leonard - State Dept. of Education - Florida FT Consultant

APPENDIX I

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT
OF HUMAN RESOURCES

513 Weil Hall

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
university of florida
gainesville, florida - 32611

FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION

Gordon E. Greenwood, Co-Director
William B. Ware, Co-Director
Hattie Bessent
Bob N. Cage
Ira J. Gordon
Barry J. Guinagh
R. Emile Jester
John M. Newell
Art Newman
Rod Webb

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

William F. Breivogel, Co-Director
Don Bernard
Mae (Stevie) Hoffman
Simon Johnson
Athol B. Packer
Joe Shea

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Alan Coller
Patricia P. Olmsted

PROJECT FOLLOW THROUGH

September 13, 1973

MEMO

TO: Liaison Officers and Consultants

FROM: G.E. Greenwood and W.F. Breivogel

RE: Consulting Procedures, 1973-74

Since we have some new consultants and liaison officers this year and since the procedures and goals have changed somewhat from Ira's earlier statement in his famed "Atlanta paper," we felt that it might be helpful to all concerned if we laid out the procedures that should be followed by consultants during 1973-74.

First, it should be remembered that each Follow Through community has a liaison officer who is responsible for all consulting activities that take place there. The role description of the liaison officer is attached.

Second, it is assumed that all consultants have properly qualified themselves to consult by: (1) reading the Follow Through literature; (2) participating in 90% of all Follow Through meetings and workshops; (3) accompanying a regular consultant on a consultant trip.

Liaison officers must remember that each community has only 18 consulting days for 1973-74 including the August preservice workshop. Also, pretest and posttest data must be gathered by consultants at the beginning and at the end of 1973-74 (HISM and SRI on new PEs and DTBs videotape data (posttest only) in most communities) and therefore trips must be scheduled to permit such data collection in either August or September and in May.

Before going on a consulting trip, the consultant should: (1) review information concerning the community by reading consulting reports filed in 520 Weil (ask Diane) and by talking with the liaison officer and recent consultants; (2) view any videotapes received and examine evaluation data available, such as the PEWR or

pretest data (ask Pat); (3) go over the "1973 Schedule of Objectives" with the liaison officer to help focus your visit and get a copy of the consultant summary report form from Diane.

When making the consulting visit, focus in on those objectives agreed upon by you and the liaison officer. Remember that we are still in the evaluation phase of Follow Through. This means that we have to try to keep the Model "pure." The Florida Model is still not a classroom model. Teacher-PE planning and role relations and the use of the PE as an instructional assistant are our classroom concerns. Do not inadvertantly cause a community to "mix models" (by, for example, helping them adopt the Kansas Model in the classroom by using their Follow Through inservice time for precision teaching).

Appropriate consulting activities should relate to the "1973-74 Schedule of Objectives" and include old standbys such as going on home visits with PEs, conducting half or full day inservice sessions for teachers and PEs, assisting teachers and PEs during classroom planning sessions (as part of the cycle), and participating in PAC meetings. Relatively new consulting activities include spending a full day working with PAC, meeting with school and community power figures (such as principals), training trainers (such as spending a full day with task specialists), and working with evaluators conducting program audits (if you are qualified to do so and if arrangements have been made).

Upon returning to Gainesville, the consultant must turn in his consulting report with the "1973-74 Schedule of Objectives" attached and the consultant summary report to Diane before he receives his consulting fee. All travel arrangements should be made through Eileen prior to the visit. Personal (non-Follow Through) travel arrangements should be made personally and not with Eileen and should not be charged to the IDHR account at the House of Travel (See Jester, Greenwood, Ware, Breivogel, or Ginger if you have questions).

Unless there is a holiday or that FERDC secretaries are on vacation, you should have your check for travel, per diem, and consulting within two days. You must write Eileen a check (made out to House of Travel) and have turned in your reports to Diane before picking up your check from Eileen.

Based on the consulting report, the liaison officer will write a consulting letter to the project coordinator and PAC Chairman within five working days after receiving the consulting report. During September, liaision officers should turn in the consulting dates for the entire year to Diane (remember to check dates out with PAC) and the names of the first five consultants (August through December).

GEG/db
Enc.

1973-74 Schedule of Objectives

Community_____

Consultant / Objectives / Dates	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	June
Increase parent use of DTBs											
PAC attendance by at least 50% of parents											
PAC related activities attendance by at least 25% of parents											
Classroom volunteering by at least 20% of parents											
Visit 80% of the homes 5/6 of the time intended											
PAC committees - formed and active											
PAC decision-making activities											
PAC contacts and impact on total school program											
Pupil achievement, self-concept and attendance gains											
Teacher knowledge of DTBs											
Teacher use of DTBs											
Teacher use of PEs for classroom instruction - 30% of time observed											
Teacher planning with PEs for home visits and task building - 1 1/2 hrs. per week per PE											
PE Knowledge of DTBs											
PE use of DTBs											

APPENDIX I

Community_____

1973-74 Schedule of Objectives

Consultant / Objectives / Dates	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	June
Self-concept and feelings of control for new PEs											
Qualified and non-qualified parents' attitudes toward program											
Increase number of parent-generated tasks											
Improve completeness of the home visits											
OTHERS (e.g., work with task specialist, work with local evaulator's staff, meet with school administration, conduct program audit)											

00268

APPENDIX I

Liaison Officer Role Description

1. Will attend 90% of "official" liaison officer and Follow Through meetings.

2. Will turn in schedules of consultants at least five months in advance to Diane Beck in September and December.

3. Will follow up to see that consulting reports and inservice data summary turned in are within two working days after the consultant's return to Gainesville.

4. Will write a consulting letter within five working days after receiving the consulting report.

5. Will communicate directly with the PAC Chairman at least once every two months to assess PAC progress (monitoring data) and consulting needs.

6. Communicate (in addition to the consulting letter) with project coordinator at least once per month to assess community needs in terms of objectives attainment (monitoring data) and to plan consulting activities.

7. Will personally visit his community during the time of proposal preparation and render appropriate assistance as well as reviewing the proposal once it is prepared. Will insist that PAC also be involved in this process.

8. Will schedule consultants to communicate with school administration (and if possible school board) at least every two months.

APPENDIX I

Job Description of the Florida Policy Advisory Committee Consultant

A. Meet individually with the Director and the PAC chairman to discuss PAC issues and concerns.

B. Meet with the PAC officers to discuss PAC issues and meeting plans.

C. Attend a PAC meeting to observe how the PAC functions.

D. Be prepared to participate, if called upon, to help with PAC problems which may arise during the meeting.

E. After the meeting, discuss with the PAC chairman and Director then put in writing all suggestions or recommendations concerning the improvement of PAC operations.

F. Meet with principals, PEs, teachers, other Follow Through staff and community organization representatives, either individually or collectively, to discuss and emphasize the role and importance of the PAC.

G. Render specific help to PACs such as:

1. organizing the PAC in accordance with the Follow Through guidelines.
2. Aiding in interpreting the guidelines of the PACs and parents.
3. Assisting in drafting a set of PAC by-laws for adoption.
4. Helping to devise a PAC calendar of activities.
5. Developing ways to get more parents active and involved in the PAC.
6. Helping to establish working sub-committees as needed.
7. Assisting the PAC in contacting and working with other local agencies which could be of benefit.
8. Aiding in setting up ways for the PAC to help evaluate the local Follow Through program.

9. Helping to establish PAC grievance procedures.

10. Assisting with the development of PAC budgets.

H. Work with the U.S. Office of Education National Follow Through staff as requested.

I. Meet with the PAC chairmen as a group to discuss and help resolve problems and issues.

J. Attend the summer workshop(s) held at the University of Florida.

After each consultant visits, the Florida consultant

A. forwards a written report, within five days, to the Director of the Institute for Development of Human Resources and the liaison officer of the community visited;

B. calls if necessary, the liaison officer, to relate any information necessary before the report is sent;

C. forwards in writing to the visited community's director and PAC chairman, a report of impressions and recommendations as a result of the visit;

D. contacts the USOE Project Officer, if necessary, to relate matters of concern after consultation with the appropriate liaison officer;

E. keeps on file records and copies of the kinds of assistance given to the community on each visit.

APPENDIX J

(Appendix J section went to Washington only)

Final Report
Tampa, Florida
1973-74

Dr. A. B. Packer

The Tampa FT project has been under the able leadership of Mrs. Clara Nuccio since its inception. Mrs Nuccio has continued to provide stability and direction to the large staff of teachers and parent educators. She has also continued the maintenance of favorable relationships between the three school principals and the Follow Through staff. Mrs. Nuccio has worked with the parents in the PAC in such a manner that many of the parents have developed excellent leadership skills. As we have mentioned in previous reports some parents who were formerly quite negative towards Follow Through have switched and become extremely supportive. Mrs. Carol Pitts, the FT PAC Chairwoman, is a shining example of a parent who has made a rather remarkable change from an "aginner" to a strong leader. Again it has been Mrs. Nuccio's strong and persuasive leadership skills which have made such changes possible.

Another positive attribute of Mrs. Nuccio is her skill in involving a wide variety of community agency workers in her staff leadership training sessions. She uses such persons as the Director of the Manpower Program, the Community Action Agency and a number of the central staff of the Hillsborough County Public Schools.

Another person who has significantly strenthened the Tampa FT work is Loretta Vacanti the Task Specialist. She has worked diligently with teachers and P.E's in task development and delivery. Fortunately funds are available to support her work for the 74-75 year.

The Teachers

The classroom teachers in Tampa are generally supportive and cooperative. They still maintain the position that FT requires substantially more of them than is required of a regular teacher. Our consultants report that teachers

are effectively using the P.E's in the classrooms.

The P.E.'s

Through the years we have had a good group of P.E.'s in Tampa. This is partially substantiated by the fact that a good number of them have taken advantage of opportunities to further their education and have completed 4-year degree programs. At least three of these persons will be taking teaching positions in Tampa classrooms for the 74-75 school year.

We have had a regular turnover in P.E.'s this year which has required that new persons be trained to carry out their work. A large amount of staff time is required for this training.

The computer data indicates that we need to continue working with P.E.'s so that they will improve their delivery of the task. Too often the P.E.'s only "told" and "showed" the tasks to the parents.

A good number of the P.E.'s also apparently didn't make a special attempt to adapt the task to the parents when delivering it. And again there is evidence that parents must be better trained in using desirable teaching behaviors when working with their children.

In general the P.E.'s reported that the parents saw the tasks as important for their children and that the children were successful in completing the tasks.

The Parents

In my opinion the Tampa FT parents compose a significant social force. Their letter writing campaigns and Washington trip-taking witness to this fact. They have repeatedly met with the county school administrators and with school board members to express their concerns about the value of the program to them and their families. They have had the Superintendent of schools in attendance at their PAC meetings. In fact they expect that school, community and state

officials will be in regular attendance at their sessions.

Again, Mrs. Nuccio has encouraged and promoted this kind of social action among the parents.

Areas for Further Work

1. Improve amount and quality of feedback from home provided by the P.E. to teacher.
2. Get research data from Gainesville written in layman's terms for principals, staff, parents, P.E.'s and teachers in Tampa!
3. Increase the involvement of parents in task development.
4. Increase the amount of parent participation and involvement in the classrooms-so that teachers and parents actually see themselves as parents in child's education.

Final Report
Lac du Flambeau, Washington
1973-74

R. E. Jester

This was an unusual year primarily because the school principal had decided to attempt coordinating the program in addition to his regular duties.

Dr. Ware and Dr. Jester worked with the staff and Mr. Bauman in early September. Both left with the uneasy feeling that there might be problems but were, at the same time, optimistic.

The next consultant visit was not made until January. Mrs. Pat Olmsted reported that there were some problems with model implementation. Particularly in that home visits were not being made in the expected quantity or quality. The next visit, in February, was made simultaneously by Mr. James Bracey and and Dr. William Ware. The focus was to be on home visits and in strengthening the PAC. This seemed to help. Dr. Ware also followed up by making a March visit. The follow-up indicated a much strengthened PAC, increased parent involvement, and awareness on Mr. Bauman's part that these changes were occurring.

Dr. Gordon Greenwood made a visit early in April which seemed to indicate that the program was beginning to smooth out. Greenwood's visit was a positive influence and the program was now beginning to align better with the guidelines.

The final visit was made by Dr. R. Jester. The indications were very positive in almost all aspects of the program. There is little doubt that the program by Fall of 1974 will be in complete compliance with all Follow Through guidelines and with Sponsor objectives.

00276

A half-time coordinator has been hired and will undergo extensive pre-service training, as well as follow-up in-service consultation.

The Year 1974-75 shows promise of being happy, good, in compliance, and above all an exceptional experience for the children.

00277

Final Report
Houston, Texas
1973-74

Dr. Hattie Bessent

The Houston program has made considerable progress during 1973-74. Houston continues to be one of our larger programs having 39 classrooms.

A major effort this past year for consultants as well as Houston's staff was to be very conscious of implementing the Florida Follow Through Model in a respectable manner. Home visits, and task presentation were concentrated on greatly.

Our objectives at the beginning of the year were partially met. One area of improvement was improving the skills of teachers in effectively utilizing their parent-educators in the classrooms. Much emphasis was put on human relations and communications with all staff.

It was felt that if principals, teachers and parent-educators could concentrate on principles of human relations, communications and interpersonal relationships, improved skills could be seen in classrooms. Great improvement was seen in most schools.

Another area of improvement was the annual parent's round-up given on two nights for 350 parents. It was successful by the mere fact parents requested another meeting of this sort. No lecturing was done, but mini talks to small groups were given by consultant and staff. The emphasis was on the role of PAC, what is PAC, what are guidelines, what officers are necessary, what committees are necessary? All mini-talks were spoken in very simple language.

Rev. Leon Everett is now school board chairman, and a new superintendent has been chosen. The relationship with the school district is very good and their support has been excellent.

The success of Houston's program continues to be in part on the growth in achievement of the children in the program. Houston continues to be fortunate to have an excellent evaluation program that continues to work well with the district's evaluation department.

It is hoped that the next year considerable effort will be spent on Desirable Teaching Behaviors and home visits with teachers and parent educators. The coordinator has not been in good health this year, but her assistants have done an excellent job in administering the program.

It is with great pleasure the next year looks good for relationships with the school board, school administrators, and the Follow Through staff. This cooperative effort is a meaningful and positive one that has been desired for some time.

Final Report
Winnsboro, South Carolina
1973-74

Dr. Simon O. Johnson

The Follow-Through Project in Winnsboro, South Carolina, is operating in two schools located about 15 miles apart. The Gordon School is located in the town of Winnsboro, and Gieger School is located in the rural area. There are 22 classrooms (1-8; 2-7; 3-7) and 601 children participating in the program. Turnover rate is about 14% for teachers and 7% for parent educators.

The following goals were identified as the most important ones to accomplish during the 1973-74 school year:

1. Increase community awareness and acceptance of the program.
2. Train the task specialist to plan and to conduct more effective inservice workshops for teachers and Parent Educators.
3. Assist Parent Educators in developing additional skills in the use of the Desirable Teaching Behaviors when presenting a task.
4. Increase the number of parent generated tasks.
5. Encourage the school officials and directors of other projects in Fairfield County to continue operating parts of the programs after the completion of the phase out.

Evaluation of the Goals:

In attempting to accomplish the first goal (community awareness) and the fifth goal (continuation of the Project) the Project Director and the staff completed the following activities:

A. An open house was planned in order for citizens to see the program in operation.

B. Articles concerning the Project were placed in the local newspaper and at radio and television stations.

C. Local business persons were invited in to learn more about the program.

D. Key citizens were invited to learn more about the program.

The awareness goal seemed to have been met with about 90% effectiveness. Hopefully, the efforts will encourage the target group to look with favor upon keeping parts of the Project in operation after the phase out.

Goal number two (training task specialist to conduct workshops) was not very successful. The major problem was that the regular task specialists (Trower) requested and received a leave of absence during the first part of the year 1974. Her replacement (Black) spent the first months attempting to learn the job. Therefore, the continuity from the inservice Trower received in August and September wasn't continued. This goal will be continued during the 1974-75 school year.

Goal three (P.E. developing becoming more effective in the use of DTBs) and four (increase the use of parent generated tasks) were given much consideration. In the absence of an experienced task specialists, consultants were scheduled to work with teachers and PE's in an effort to accomplish the goals. Even though progress was shown in each of the above areas, additional assistance is needed. These goals will be addressed more forcefully during the summer workshop in Winnsboro.

SUMMARY

During the 1973-74 school year much progress was made concerning the effective operation of the program. Success such as role development and cooperative efforts of the staff concerning the attainment of the goals were considered as important. The improvements were viable in the attainment of many of the stated goals and objectives for the

the project.

Winnsboro still has many problems that should be solved, for example, how to encourage the school officials to appropriate funds in order to keep parts of the program in operation after the phase out. Nevertheless, much progress has been made, and the Project is running smoothly.

59282

Final Report
Lawrenceburg, Indiana
1973-74

Dr. G. E. Greenwood

The Follow Through Program in Lawrenceburg, Indiana, appeared to pretty much function the same way during 1973-74 as it did during 1972-73. In spite of consulting efforts to the contrary, the strengths and weaknesses seem to remain the same.

A number of strengths can be cited. The program's community image has changed to the point where it is now the "in-thing" to have one's child in the program. The superintendent of schools, the school board, and the building principal all support the program and are often seen at PAC meetings. It is the plan of the community to continue the program in the entering grade if the phase-out continues. So overall the program is strong.

However, certain weaknesses remain to plague progress. Many teachers and some parent educators still believe that "the classroom is where it is at" and, as a result, some teachers don't plan with their parent educators and some parent educators simply don't make weekly home visits. Many of the tasks are of poor quality and are poorly delivered. PE absenteeism is sometimes excessive. To make matters worse, the project administration has to be pressured by the model sponsored before attempts are made to deal with these problems locally.

09283

The other big problem area continues to be that of PAC. While the PAC chairperson is now a low income parent, no one works with her locally to help her learn her role. Many of the meetings are without decision-making purpose and involve speakers and "entertainment." Also, the participation of low-income parents is is still far below that of upper-income parents. Perhaps next year will be the year that the PAC will really get moving.

Overall, the Lawrenceburg program is strong but has a few problems that have not lent themselves to easy solution.

Final Report
Jacksonville, Florida
1973-74

Dr. G. E. Greenwood

1973-74 has been a year of crisis and reorganization for the Jacksonville Follow Through Program. During the first half of the year, old antagonisms between the Project Coordinator and the PAC were increased to the point of crisis. The culminating events were the hiring of a parent involvement specialist without the full approval of PAC and the expectation on the part of the Project Coordinator that PAC would sign off on the 1973-74 proposal without fully examining it. The ensuing crisis led to a change in Project Coordinators. The new Coordinator, Jeanette Hazouri, has been very effective thus far in reestablishing good relations with the PAC and in trying to heal other "old wounds." She has also been effective in retraining her staff to assume leadership roles in the program.

Jacksonville's strengths would then appear to be a new dynamic, and effective Project Coordinator, a reorganized Follow Through staff, and an effective, "happy" PAC operating under strong PAC leadership. These elements appear to have such general overall strength that the program finally appears likely to succeed.

However, there are a number of areas of weakness that must be worked on. First, the program is spread over a large number of schools and while most principals are supportive, a few are not and must be worked with. Second, while the PAC is generally functioning better than ever, some of the PAC committees continue to need

strengthening. Third, many of the home learning tasks are of poor quality and are poorly delivered. A greater number of parent-generated tasks need to be written up and sent into homes. Fourth, some of the parent educators aren't making home visits and aren't turning in PEWR's. Last, some of the teachers aren't planning with their parent educators and seem to be supported in this by their principal.

Most of the upper-administration and parents continue to be supportive of the program. It is in a very good position to have its very best year during 1974-75.

09286

Final Report
Richmond, Virginia
1973-74

Dr. W. F. Breivogel

Although there was a minimum of court ordered student movement this year (there was transfer of some students to other schools because of overcrowding pairing of schools) there was a continuing problem of stability of personnel (teachers, Parent Educators) especially in the evaluation position. The year (1973-74) started with Ray Garguilo as Follow Through evaluator. (He had been evaluator for 1972-73) but moved to another position in the Richmond school system in September. After a lapse of two months a young woman (Sally Kelly) was hired in November (73). By this time many of the projected plans for pre-data collection were not possible to accomplish, in fact many of the instruments which were to be used to collect the data had not been developed/ selected by December when Dr. Bill Ware vivited Richmond to offer assistance to Ms. Kelly. By March (74) Ms. Kelly had left the position. She was not replaced then and will not be replaced for the coming year (1974-75).

There were also some problems with PEWR forms being collected from the Parent Educators and sent to Florida for processing. The person in that role will not be with Richmond Follow Through next year. A system has been developed to remedy this problem and a dependable, competent person will be placed in this position.

There was also a problem in the area of career development. The person in that position will not be with Follow Through next year and the position will not be filled.

Richmond Follow Through has been fortunate in the school system support it has gained over the years. There are three area superintendents

in Richmond with Follow Through schools in each of these areas. Two of the three area directors (Nat Lee, former Richmond Federal Projects Director has been a strong supporter and has been to Florida a number of times, his assistant Dan Nix is now Federal Projects Director, is a strong supporter and has been to Florida a number of times. Ms. Lois Jones was a former principal of a Richmond Follow Through School, she is a strong supporter, and had also been to Florida. The third area director Dr. Bob Frossard has become knowledgeable about the program and is a strong supporter.

The Rev. Myles Jones, president of the Richmond Board, has been to Florida and is a strong supporter.

PAC has had consistent leadership over the years. There has been a strong, supporting central core of people who have given exceptional amounts of time to the Richmond PAC.

With all the problems: personnel and continuing movement of children from school to school, there continues to be great interest on the part of parents in the Follow Through program. Richmond has demonstrated good faith by channeling Title I money into a limites summer program for Follow Through children. Follow Through has also set the pace in Richmond for parent involvement which is mandated in Title I.

Final Report
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
1973-74

Dr. Barry J. Guinagh

Below are the objectives set out for 1974-75. The summary of 1973-74 will be based on these objectives.

The first objectives for 74-75 is to strengthen the entire local inservice training staff so they can take over inservice and preservice training. During 73-74, the coordinator of the program, Mrs. Floyda Marcus, had two deaths in her immediate family. This hurt the continuity of the program. The staff understands the model well; the problems come in administering the model. There has been much trouble in seeing that the program is carried out during 73-74. This is mainly due to the deaths in Mrs. Marcus' family.

The second objective for next year is to increase the number of parents participating in PAC and at committee meetings. Some gains have been made in this area during 1973-74. There is now a monthly team meeting with all the staff, administration, representatives from the superintendent's office, along with parents, who discuss problems. This gives parents the chance to be heard. In addition, the Follow Through parents organized this past year to object to the cut backs in Follow Through. Their efforts were successful, and the entering grades were refunded, although at a smaller funding level. Several of the parents in the Florida Follow Through model are very active in PAC, and Doris Cohen is the chairperson of the city wide PAC. Naturally, there is always room for improvement, particularly at Stevens School where there is little parent involvement; but in general the parent participation has been a bright spot in 73-74.

The third objective for 74-75 is to increase the percentages of home visits completed. This has been a real problem in 73-74. A letter was written to Lee Scott, Director of Follow Through.

"As you know, in the past we have been concerned with the number of home visits made in the Florida Model Follow Through Program. Since the home visit is the core of our model, a low percentage of home visits indicated the model is not being implemented.

We have done an analysis of the percentages of visits made by school. We find great differences between the completion rate between Stevens and Nebinger. For example, at Nebinger 25.2% of the possible visits were not attempted. In neither case is this as low as our national average (15% not attempted), but the figure for Nebinger certainly indicates an effort while the high figure of 63.5% of visits not even attempted indicates that the model is not being implemented there. It also should be noted that the figures for Nebinger have improved since the beginning of the year.

The percentages for completed visits also indicate the same problem. At Nebinger, 48.9% of the visits are made, while at Stevens only 3.7% of the visits are made. This compares to our national average of 62%. We are also not receiving all the Parent Educator Weekly Reports, PEWR's) necessary to give an accurate account of the program. At Nebinger 20.4% of the weekly reports are not received, while at Stevens the figure is 49.6%. This compares to our national average of 17%.

We are asking that the program at Stevens not be included in the 1973-74 national evaluation. Since the Florida Model has not been implemented at Stevens, it is misrepresentative to evaluate Stevens School as if it were implementing the Florida Model. Second, we need to discuss further with you what can be done to see that the model is implemented at Stevens during the next school year."

The above letter was answered by both Lee Scott and Morris Berkowitz, Principal at Stevens stating that the weekly home vists would be reviewed weekly and an audit would be made of individual work of parent educators.

The forth objective was to increase the knowledge and acceptance of the Florida Parent Education Program by school administrators. This has been done. Lee Scott is very supportive of the program. She is generally supportive of parent involvement.

The fifth objective is to increase teacher acceptance of and participation in the program with particular emphasis on teacher planning. There has been little change in the involvement of teachers. The model still is having difficulty getting teachers involved with the home visit phase of the program.

The sixth objective for next year is to increase the number of parent generated tasks. There has been improvement in this area in 73-74. There is now a parent curriculum committee, and several parents are spending a great deal of time developing activities for home visits.

The seventh objective for 74-75 is to increase the amount of consulting activity in the classroom. This has been done to some degree in 73-74. The consultants have met with several of the classroom teams and have discovered problems. The consultants always try to talk to the teachers about what they saw during the home visit.

The major problem in Philadelphia continues to be the low percentage of home visits completed. We hope that with the development of a weekly audit of each parent educator's performance this situation will improve in 74-75.

Final Report
Yakima, Washington
1973-74

William B. Ware

The Follow Through program in Yakima, Washington progressed at an excellent rate under the capable direction of Ms. Anna Uebelacker. Since the inception of the project in 1968, Yakima has been able to develop some excellent local resources from which the project can draw support.

The central staff of the project is capable of working intensively with new teachers and parent educators coming into the program, and is also capable of working continually with the staff already in the program. Adequate evaluation services are available locally in addition.

During 1973-74 five separate sitevisits were made by sponsor representatives. Dr. Ware, the liaison officer, visited the project in August to assist with the initial training of new personnel. At that time, it was noted that there was a high degree of involvement on the part of local staff. It was also noted at the time that the PAC needed organization and the leadership needed to be developed. In January, Dr. Johnson visited Yakima to work with several groups of teachers in the use of learning centers and parent educators in the classroom.

In February, Ms. Olmsted visited the project. Major activities of her visit included home visiting with parent educators and inservice for parent educators centering on the use of DTB's. The implementation of the DTB's in home visits is one of the few weak spots in the program in Yakima.

00292

Dr. Jester visited the project in April. A good part of his visit was devoted to contact with groups of parents and other community groups. The last visit of the year was made by Dr. Ware. In addition to tying up some loose ends, he also observed some teacher-PE planning sessions, which could use some strengthening. Also, a review of home visits indicated a weakness in DTB implementation.

In conclusion, the Yakima project seems basically sound. Two areas needing attention during 1974-75 are DTB implementation and PAC (parent) organization.

09293

Final Report
Chattanooga, Tennessee
1973-74

William B. Ware

The academic year 1973-74 was one of drastic changes for the project in Chattanooga. These changes can be traced to the implementation of a court order to engage in cross town busing for purposes of desegregation. The court order was enacted in January. Prior to that time, the program progressed as might be expected, with the sponsor providing such services as necessary to implement the "standard" Florida Parent Education program. After the court order, initial efforts attempted to seek ways in which to implement the regular program under the new conditions. After a short time, the combination of new local conditions and reduced Federal support for 1974-75 became persuasive and changed the course of the Chattanooga project.

After joint meetings of LEA staff, sponsor representative, and project officer, it was agreed that Chattanooga should attempt to modify the Parent Education Model to fit local conditions. A good deal of subsequent energy was used to clarify the nature of the program and its relationship to the sponsor.

The modified program will continue to stress the sponsor philosophy of involving parents in the education of their children. However, rather than having two paraprofessionial aides/classroom making home visits, the outreach will be managed by a home-school paraprofessional coordinator who will work with groups of parents in addition to making home contacts.

At this time it is difficult to assess the status of the project in Chattanooga. However, a combination of factors (a dedicated coordinator and capable staff, a committed LEA, and experienced parents) would suggest that the program in Chattanooga will continue to be effective as it has been in the past.

09291

Final Report
Jonesboro, Arkansas
1973-74

Rodman Webb

The Jonesboro, Arkansas Follow Through Project has rebounded nicely from the problems created in the school system by the disastrous tornado that ravaged the area some time ago. During this year an effort was made to improve the quality of home visits. All consultants emphasized this topic (though it was not our exclusive concern) and progress was evident. Jonesboro teachers and PEs performed well on the Desirable Teaching Behavior instrument and the quality of home visits was improved. A higher completion rate was achieved in qualified homes and great progress was made in the completion rate in non-qualified homes as well. The 72-73 school year ended with a completion rate in qualified homes of 58.24% but a 74.41% completion rate was maintained through April, 1974. The no PEWR rate dropped in this category from 23.5% to 7.7% over the same period. The non-qualified category improved from a completion rate of 25.71% at the end of 72-73 to a rate of 53.37% through April, 1974. The no PEWR rate fell from 66.4% to 13.3% over the same period.

There is a need to improve the quality of teacher-PE planning sessions and to instill in teachers a higher sense of responsibility for the quality of PE performance. We plan to improve in this area by arranging home visits for selective teachers.

The PAC functions in Jonesboro as an effective and forceful body when there are specific tasks to be tackled. In normal, unproblematic times, however, PAC serves only a perfunctory function. It's meetings are not large unless entertainment or some other come-on is advertised. There are PAC activities, however, which serves a useful community function (arts and crafts classes for example) but the organization is not intimately and ongoingly connected with the daily functions of the Follow Through Project in Jonesboro. We hope to make

improvements in this area during the next year.

The coordinator, Nettie Whitehead, is the backbone and driving force of the Jonesboro program. She is hard working, personable and talented in her job. She manages to handle an enormous amount of work and to do it effectively and with a good deal of grace. She has, however, more work than any one person can handle and is in need of assistance. A full time social worker and a full time task-parent educator specialist would improve the program significantly.

The classroom practices in Jonesboro continued to be a strong point of the program. Teacher-Parent Educator relationships are strong and PEs are, for the most part, used productively in the classroom. Principals have been cooperative and both teachers and parent educators have been geniunely supportive of the program.

09296